

# The Dublin Review

APRIL, 1940

No. 413

## VATICAN DIPLOMACY AND PEACE

**P**RESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S decision to appoint a personal representative at the Holy See for the special purpose of keeping in touch with any possible steps towards restoring peace was obviously a clear indication that the Pope has been actively pursuing the endeavours of Benedict XV in the last war. There is every reason to believe that Pius XII is devoting his attention to promoting a cessation of hostilities with no less fervour than was displayed by Benedict XV; and while his endeavours are being conducted with greater diplomatic advantages, they have also been met with more widespread sympathy and understanding. His Holiness has, in these first months of war, made fewer public appeals to the belligerents than were made by Benedict XV in the corresponding period of the last war. But his diplomatic contacts are now much more numerous and more influential, and his long experience in conciliatory negotiations has probably convinced him that the ground must be very carefully prepared, and that open diplomacy is usually barren of results.

The influence of Benedict XV upon the attitude of the Vatican towards war in Europe must impress everyone who studies the Papal pronouncements of the past twenty years. Papal policy has been continued since his death by those who not only took part in his efforts at pacification during the last war but have shown themselves to be his disciples. It was Benedict XV who selected Mgr. Ratti when he was librarian at the Vatican to undertake as Apostolic Visitor, in the last year of the war, the mission to Poland which was to continue through the disruption of the Austrian Empire and the critical years of reconstruction when Poland was consolidated as an independent State. In the previous year Benedict had decided that a supreme appeal for peace must be made, and that he must put forward proposals himself since

President Wilson could no longer intervene as a neutral. In preparation for that attempt he had chosen Mgr. Pacelli as his new Nuncio to Munich, whose first duty was to interview the German Chancellor and the Kaiser to see whether assurances could be obtained that Germany would restore the independence of Belgium. And at the same time his Nuncio in Switzerland, who was the principal organizer of his work for the exchange of prisoners and the administration of relief, was Mgr. Maglione. Within a short period they had all assumed positions of immense responsibility during the years of reconstruction. Mgr. Ratti had become Pope as Pius XI, Mgr. Pacelli had moved from Munich to Berlin as Nuncio to all Germany, and Mgr. Maglione had moved from Berne to Paris, as Nuncio to France. Their association became still more close when Mgr. Pacelli was recalled from Berlin to succeed Cardinal Gasparri as Secretary of State, and Mgr. Maglione came back to Rome as one of the principal directors of Vatican policy in various Congregations. And a year ago, when Pius XI died and Cardinal Pacelli was elected to succeed him, Cardinal Maglione became his new Secretary of State.

This long experience in European diplomacy and the intimate knowledge of Germany and France acquired by both the new Pope and his Secretary, provide advantages in dealing with the present crisis in Europe which were not possessed by Benedict XV. The contrast between the diplomatic position of the Holy See in 1914 and in 1939 is very remarkable. The pontificate of Pius X had been marked by bitter conflicts with the Liberal Governments everywhere. Both France and Portugal had severed their traditional diplomatic relations with the Holy See and had become actively hostile to the Church. In France the confiscation of Church property, the expulsion of the religious congregations, the determined onslaught against religious education, and the victimization of army officers and civil servants who were known to be practising Catholics, were the outcome of a régime which was certainly not less anti-Catholic than the Nazi régime is anti-Catholic today. In Italy also the anti-clericals were in power and the Government's



attitude to the Vatican was still thoroughly hostile. When Benedict was elected Pope early in September 1914 he was crowned almost privately in the Sistine Chapel; and in the small diplomatic corps which was represented at the ceremonies the only diplomats who represented the belligerent States were those of Austria, Prussia, Bavaria, and Belgium. In such circumstances the possibility of exerting any effective influence for peace might well seem remote. France was still controlled by impenitently anti-Catholic politicians. And Italy was so determined to prevent any extension of the Vatican's international influence that when, in the following May, Italy decided to enter the war for the recovery of Trieste and the Trentino, the Secret Treaty of London contained an explicit proviso that the Holy See must not be allowed to originate negotiations for peace and must be excluded from any eventual peace conference.

Nor was Benedict XV, at the time of his election, widely known, even in Italy, as a conspicuous public figure. He had been Archbishop of Bologna for eight years, and since the election of Pius X he had been removed from his former office as Assistant Secretary of State under Cardinal Rampolla. His earlier training under Rampolla's tutelage was to be of immense value in the diplomatic tasks which confronted him, but in the intervening years the diplomatic influence of the Holy See had been gravely weakened by the rupture of relations with both France and Portugal. There was certainly little reason to expect that within some three months after his election he would have so far enhanced the influence of the Holy See that even the British Government would find it necessary to appoint a resident Minister at the Vatican. That decision was compelled by many unexpected causes. Not least among them was Roger Casement's success in persuading the German Government to assemble all the Irish prisoners of war in one camp at Limburg where chaplains were sent by the Pope to serve them at the request of the German Government. That was only one instance of the practical problems which in wartime affected the rights and actions of the Church. They created an urgent need for direct access to the Holy

See, which the Central Powers already enjoyed while the Allied Powers were without the means of either stating their case or requesting favours.

The British Government's decision to appoint a representative at the Vatican was soon followed by other Governments as the war progressed, and still more in the years after the war ended. But it was all the more significant in December 1914, because public opinion concerning the Vatican in the Allied countries deeply resented the absence of any Papal condemnation of the German invasion of Belgium and the atrocities which accompanied it. Cardinal Mercier's defiance of the military occupation had made his name a household word in England and France and even in the United States. British public opinion in the first months of the war was absolutely convinced that England had been drawn into the war solely for the protection of Belgium and in fulfilment of the guarantee of its independence which Germany also had given but had shamefully violated. If ever there were a clear case for moral condemnation by the Holy See, the German conduct in Belgium seemed to demand it immediately. Yet Pius X had remained completely silent in face of the German invasion, and his successor appeared to lack the moral courage even to support Cardinal Mercier in his heroic resistance to aggression. As the months passed rumours spread that Cardinal Mercier had been all but reprimanded by the Holy See for having encouraged his people to assert their rights. That the British Government should in such circumstances break with all the traditions of a Protestant country, in asking permission to send a resident Minister to the Vatican, was one of the mysteries of those early months of war.

These complaints of the Pope's silence in regard to Belgium found such widespread expression in the English Press, and in pamphlets which purported to prove the pro-German sympathies of the Vatican, that Cardinal Bourne found it necessary to reply to them publicly in a sermon preached on 30 May, 1915, at Hammersmith. He pointed out that Englishmen had long prided themselves on being free from obedience to the authority of the Catholic Church and that the "ordinary attitude of the

English mind towards the Catholic Church had for the most part been an attitude of contempt". Englishmen in 1870 "were not sorry that the freedom of the Holy See was lessened". And he continued :

Is it not a wonderful spectacle that those who would have been the first to reject and resist any action of the Holy See, should now, in this time of stress and anxiety, come to invoke the power of the Holy See on the side of England and that civilization for which England is fighting today ? And in their disappointment because they cannot bring it about that the Holy See should take action as they are pleased to dictate, they go to the other extreme and accuse the Holy See of silence, when in many ways it has spoken, only in ways to which they give no heed and of which they do not care to know . . . It is a strange phenomenon that men, representative of English thought, who once would have refused to hear any appeal from Rome, are now the very first to condemn what they regard as the silence of the Holy See. The whole of their criticism is based on the fallacy that no protest is of any value unless it be shouted from the housetops and published in the daily papers. Unless there is a protest given in that way they count it non-existent.

It was scarcely surprising that English opinion regarded Benedict's general references to the war, in his November encyclical and in his Allocution to the Cardinals in January, as being inadequate. Cardinal Bourne naturally drew attention to these pronouncements, which had respectively "set forth principles, which must never be forsaken" and "stigmatized certain operations in the war at present being carried on". But the chief complaint was that the Pope had not openly condemned the brutal invasion of Belgium by a Power which had guaranteed to protect its inviolability. It was extremely difficult at that stage of the war to explain the real reason for the Pope's silence, which was that crimes had been committed also on the Allied side and that he could not condemn one side without condemning the other at the same time. Certainly the Vatican possessed ample evidence to justify a public condemnation for both sides ; and in the present war there has been less hesitation in denouncing atrocities in Poland. But the denunciation has been made through the Vatican broadcasts and through the *Osservatore*

*Romano*, which now enjoys a freedom from interference that certainly did not exist before the conclusion of the Lateran Treaty. Benedict had decided to abstain from public condemnations in his official pronouncements, and Cardinal Bourne defended his decision on the ground that no condemnation by the Holy See was possible until there had been time and opportunity to collect the necessary evidence and to hear both sides. The Germans had in fact asserted that the Belgians had repudiated their neutrality before the war began. That plea was so fantastic that Cardinal Bourne could not put it forward as a defence of the Pope's silence, but he insisted that on general principles "anything in the nature of a juridical process in the present case is entirely out of the question".

The only action, therefore, left to the Holy See in a matter of this kind is that extra-judicial procedure which, in the case of the Holy See, must be exercised by the accredited representatives of the Pope himself. There at once we get into a region about which no journalist, no minister of religion, no writer in magazines, has any competence at all to judge, because he can have no means whatever of knowing what has actually taken place.

Cardinal Bourne could not argue publicly that there was a pretext for Germany's violation of Belgium which the Holy See was obliged to consider seriously, but he did state openly, and with considerable courage, that there had been crimes committed on the Allied side which had caused deep distress at the Vatican. The Pope, he insisted, "has to consider every nation alike".

While we know, and can have no doubt in this country, of the terrible things that have been wrought, especially in Belgium, we must never forget that similar accusations, hardly less in gravity, have been made—I do not pronounce on their truth, because I have no means of doing so—in the most circumstantial way against one of our Allies, namely Russia, about its treatment of the Galician Poles. If the Holy Father is to speak publicly in condemnation, all these questions must come before him if he is not to fail in that duty of justice and impartiality which is his special prerogative. No allusion has been made to these things in our English newspapers—whether because they do not know or are not allowed to speak I cannot tell—but there are statements which I know to have been brought in the strongest form to the

notice of the Holy See, in which those who stand against us in this terrific conflict accuse one of our Allies of conduct, as I say, not unlike what has happened in Belgium.

Within a few months after Cardinal Bourne's statement an official condemnation concerning Belgium was actually issued from the Vatican, in response to persistent inquiries from France. It came in a communication from the Pope to Cardinal Amette, repudiating an alleged interview with the Pope which had been published by a French journalist, M. Latapie. The letter was accompanied by another which had been addressed by Cardinal Gasparri to the Belgian Minister at the Vatican. This letter explained :

Here is the literal truth : The Chancellor of the German Empire, von Bethmann-Hollweg, declared openly in public Parliament on 4 August that Germany, in invading Belgium was violating its neutrality contrary to international law. While, then, in the present conflict as a general rule one side accuses and the other denies, and the Holy See consequently, being unable to conduct an inquiry and find out the truth, cannot make any pronouncement, in this case the German Chancellor himself recognized that in the invasion of Belgium a violation of neutrality was committed, contrary to international law, justifying it simply on the grounds of military necessity. It follows that the invasion of Belgium is directly included in the words used by the Holy Father in the Consistorial Allocution of 22 January last, when he *condemned openly every injustice by whatever side and for whatever motive committed*. It is true that in the meanwhile Germany has published some documents of the Belgian General Staff by means of which she claims to prove that previous to the war Belgium had failed in the duties of neutrality which therefore, at the moment of the invasion, did not exist any longer. It was not the business of the Holy See to decide this question of history, nor for its purpose was there any necessity for a decision. For the reason that, even admitting the German point of view, it would always remain true that Germany, on the confession of her own Chancellor, penetrated into Belgian territory with the consciousness of violating its neutrality and therefore committing an injustice ; and that suffices for Germany's action to be comprised directly in the words of the Pontifical Allocution.

That statement by Cardinal Gasparri clearly indicates the attitude of the Holy See towards complaints made

by either side in wartime. That attitude will presumably be unchanged in the present war. It should be noted, however, that no other neutral sovereign or State issued any formal denunciation concerning the violation of Belgium's neutrality throughout the war. There is less disposition now than in 1914 to regard the Holy See as a judicial tribunal from which judgements on the conduct of the war can be expected while it is in progress. Yet this view of its functions persisted so strongly in England that when Benedict XV died in January 1922, the obituary article in *The Times* was chiefly devoted to complaints of his refusal to pronounce judgement between the belligerents.

This same tendency to ignore facts known to all the civilized world [it said], was seen again and again in other messages and letters. Benedict XV remained true to his upbringing. He was ever in his public pronouncements too much the diplomatist, too little the uncompromising servant of "The Good Shepherd, Jesus Christ, whose place we occupy in ruling the world". He appealed to Francis Joseph, to the Kaiser, to the Tsar, to President Wilson, but always with the same absence of the condemnation of outrages . . . The position which he adopted was of a spiritual "neutrality" so strict that he could hardly be acquitted of shutting his eyes, as far as was possible, to all charges brought against the Germans, and, when that was not feasible, of endeavouring to counter them by charges against the other side. Those, in fact, who expected the Pope to act as an arbitrator between right and wrong were for a long time bitterly disappointed. It was difficult in those days to avoid the conclusion that strong German influence had been brought to bear upon him, and that he had not the requisite strength to stand against it.

*The Times* obituary concludes by asserting that "his neutrality can hardly escape the charge of having been somewhat one-sided, and the tragedy of his attitude was that though in the end he did outspokenly condemn some of the greater wrongs of the war, he made his protest too late, and lost the great chance of exerting his influence at the beginning, when it might have done much good". In retrospect, we may well wonder what "good" such condemnations could possibly have achieved at the time, while it is obvious that the Holy See would have incurred the hostility of both sides if it had made a



practice of proclaiming moral judgements on the progress of the war. If it had assumed such a role, it would presumably have been obliged to issue repeated denunciations of submarine sinkings at sea. But when the full effect of the blockade became felt in Germany, it could scarcely have escaped the necessity of appealing for its relaxation in the name of humanity. There were incidents again and again on both sides which called for reprobation, and it is difficult to believe that denunciations by the Pope would have had the slightest effect in preventing them.

Moreover, the role which was thus expected of Benedict XV would have implied that he recognized that the issues in dispute could only be settled by continuing the war. He had no intention of acting as umpire in such a contest. On the contrary, he proclaimed from the very beginning that the whole war was a denial of Christian principles and that he would not cease to work for its cessation. Pius X died on August 20, the day that Brussels was occupied, and the French Government left Paris for Bordeaux while the Conclave was still in session. Benedict was crowned on September 6. And only two days later he was appealing for peace negotiations to stop the war. His exhortation concluded with a passage addressed directly to the rulers of the nations, in which he said: "We earnestly beg and implore them even now to turn their thoughts to laying aside their quarrels for the sake of preserving human society. Let them reflect that there is already too much of misery and grief linked with this mortal life, so that it may not be made still more wretched and sorrowful. Let them agree that already enough of ruin has been caused, enough of human blood has been shed. Let them hasten to open peace negotiations and join hands again." These were no mere rhetorical expressions of his horror at the massacres that were already in progress on both sides of Europe. He renewed his appeal within less than two months, in his first encyclical, and in the subsequent year he proclaimed with increasing emphasis that he would never desist from his efforts to stop the war. "We implore those in whose hands the fortunes of nations are placed to hearken to our voice," he wrote in his first encyclical, before the first

battle of Ypres. "Surely there are other ways and means by which violated rights can be rectified. Let them be honestly and sincerely tried, and in the meantime let arms be laid aside."

His endeavours to alleviate the sufferings of prisoners, and to obtain the exchange of wounded men incapacitated from further service met with considerable success, and won the thanks of the Governments on both sides. He succeeded in securing the appointment of chaplains for all prisoners and ordered that they must be chosen for their knowledge of the necessary languages, and that they must communicate with the families of all prisoners who were unable to write. But these acts of charity were only subsidiary to his main purpose, which he made increasingly clear. He insisted that such works of charity should be multiplied precisely because they tended to diminish racial hatreds and mitigated the anger of those who took part in them. Before the first Christmas of the war he attempted to arrange a truce on all fronts for the Christmas festival, with the same object in view—partly to give a brief respite from their anxiety to those whose husbands or sons were in danger, and still more in the hope that even so brief a cessation of hostilities would strengthen the desire for peace. On Christmas Eve, when he addressed the Cardinals, he expressed his sorrow at the failure of his attempt and proclaimed most definitely that "We are not discouraged and we intend to put forth every effort to hasten the end of this unparalleled scourge, or at least to alleviate its miserable consequences." After a year of war he appealed again with extraordinary passion to the rulers of the belligerent countries. "In the holy name of God, in the name of our heavenly Father and Lord, by the Blessed Blood of Jesus, the price of man's redemption, we conjure you whom Divine Providence has placed over the nations at war to put an end at last to this horrible slaughter which for a whole year has dishonoured Europe."

The full story of his negotiations as peace-maker has never been revealed. But the broad lines of his policy are well known. He did not seek to mediate directly between the belligerents, but he was all the time preparing

the ground in Europe for peace negotiations with the intention that President Wilson, as the most powerful and the least directly involved of the neutral rulers, should intervene, when the favourable moment arose, with either an offer of mediation or proposals for a peace conference. Through Cardinal Gibbons he conveyed his wishes to President Wilson, but there was great difficulty in maintaining contact with the President at such a distance, and there was as yet no question of any direct diplomatic representation of the United States at the Vatican. Wilson was strongly in sympathy with the Pope's wishes, but he found it impossible to take the initiative until one side or other had shown willingness to consider such proposals. At the end of 1916, after Wilson had been re-elected to the Presidency on the issue of continuing to keep out of the war, Wilson did issue a request to all the belligerents to state their war aims. But it only provoked resentment at American interference, and within a few months afterwards the intensified submarine campaign resulted in America's entry into the war as a belligerent. Benedict's chief hope of a successful peace intervention from America was thus destroyed, at a time when the situation seemed to demand a peace effort more urgently than ever. There was every prospect that the war would be prolonged indefinitely while America's war effort was being organized, and after three years of war Europe was reduced to a state of extreme exhaustion. But the entry of the United States into the war had at last confronted the Central Powers with a prospect which might dissuade them from pursuing a war in which they had otherwise been victorious on both fronts. They had in turn overcome Belgium, Serbia and Roumania, and the Russian army was so shattered and so short of equipment that Hindenburg could already declare that the "Russian colossus has fallen". Both in France, since the disastrous failure of General Niville's offensive on the Chemin des Dames, and in Italy war weariness was already apparent. But in Austria the young Emperor Charles had shown openly that he also desired an early peace.

Now that America could no longer offer mediation,

there was no other neutral State of sufficient influence to take the initiative with any hope of success. For the Pope to issue definite proposals of peace meant taking the supreme risk of failure which would make any second attempt impossible. But Benedict decided that the attempt must be made without further delay. Reports from Russia indicated that a complete collapse of the Empire was approaching rapidly, and if that should happen, the Central Powers would be free to withdraw immense forces from the eastern front and undertake a new onslaught in the west in the spring, which would involve greater carnage and destruction than the war had yet witnessed. There could be no hope of avoiding it, because the Central Empires must now stake everything on attempting a decisive victory before the United States could intervene with their whole resources. To prevent that appalling prospect Benedict prepared to make a final effort to promote a peace conference. The first condition of success must be to ascertain whether Germany was ready to relinquish Belgium and the occupied territory of France as the indispensable step towards arranging an armistice.

The whole story of those negotiations, and the lessons to be learned from their failure, are better known to Pope Pius XII than to any other man now alive. It was he who was dispatched by Benedict XV as the new Nuncio to Munich, with instructions to interview the German Chancellor and discover whether the necessary assurances could be obtained. Precisely similar conditions today confront him, as Benedict's successor engaged on the same task of attempting to stop the war. The main facts of his negotiation in 1917 are generally known. Bethmann-Hollweg expressed his belief that Germany would agree to restore Belgium's independence, and the Kaiser confirmed this view, but Bethmann-Hollweg was very soon afterwards superseded as Chancellor by Dr. Michaelis, and the military authorities thereafter gained complete control, although the Reichstag passed Erzberger's resolution in favour of a moderate peace. But enough information had been obtained to encourage Benedict to continue. It was useless to approach the

Allied Powers until assurances had first been secured from Germany, and they received no previous intimation of the Pope's peace proposals which were sent out on August 2, in a letter addressed to the Rulers of all the Belligerent Peoples.

The five points which he put forward in the summer of 1917 as the basis for peace negotiations were not in themselves impossible of acceptance. First, he insisted that Right must be accepted instead of Armed Force as the basis of future peace; secondly that this must imply simultaneous and reciprocal disarmament; thirdly, the institution of arbitration in international disputes, with "true liberty of and common rights over the sea". Fourthly, there should be a "mutual condonation" of the costs of the war, except in special cases where reparation might be found necessary, because no proposals for reparation seemed feasible, and the relief accruing from general disarmament would in itself be an immense compensation. Fifthly, there must be "reciprocal restitution of occupied territories", so that Germany would withdraw from the invaded areas but would recover her lost colonies. All outstanding disputes should then be settled by arbitration, on principles of equity and feasibility and with due regard for the wishes of the population concerned.

It was not the proposals themselves but the conditions existing at the time which led to the rejection of the Pope's attempt. The two main difficulties were precisely those which operate at the present time. The German armies had been victorious on both fronts and had conquered immense and vitally important territories. Their success had been so overwhelming that the German High Command believed that still greater victories could be won and that the Allies could be compelled to accept a dictated peace. Within a few months after the Pope's peace proposals they succeeded in defeating Italy at Caporetto; they compelled the Bolshevik Government to accept the extravagant terms of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk; and in the following spring Ludendorff's offensives against the British and French armies smashed through the lines which had been held for three years, and would in all probability have captured Paris if the

American divisions had not become a deciding factor in Foch's counter-offensive. But even while Germany's military position was still so strong, it was at least possible that the German people would have refused to continue a victorious war if the Allies had been willing to enter peace negotiations at a time when they were so gravely at a disadvantage. If peace in 1917 would have involved disappointment to the German High Command, it would certainly have involved at least the appearance of defeat for the Allies. Refusal to accept defeat must always be the chief obstacle to any attempt at peace-making. In all the Allied countries except Belgium it resulted, as is well known, in bitter condemnation of the Pope's interference. It was not unnaturally regarded as an attempt to sow dissension between them and produce separate peace negotiations even if all were not ready to negotiate. And in addition to this very natural refusal to discuss peace terms at a disadvantage there was, in 1917, just as there is today, a deep conviction that Germany's promises could not be trusted and that another war would follow if Germany had not been decisively defeated. President Wilson's reply to Benedict's Peace Note might almost have been written yesterday. "To deal with such a Power by way of peace upon the plan proposed by His Holiness the Pope," he wrote, "would, so far as we can see, involve a recuperation of its strength and a renewal of its policy; would make it necessary to create a permanent hostile combination of the nations against the German people who are its instruments. . . . We cannot take the word of the present rulers of Germany as a guarantee of anything to endure."

It is certainly not easy to see what action Benedict XV could have taken to overcome these difficulties, which confront his successor today with even greater force. But the experience of those years has plainly decided the method of the reigning Pontiff in his own efforts to restore peace. It was notable, for instance, that the Pope apparently did not renew the appeal of Benedict XV for a cessation of hostilities during the first Christmas of the war. There was obviously no hope of success for such an appeal to Moscow in regard to Finland, and the



conquest of Poland was already accomplished. But the Pope was able to go very much further in the first Christmas of his pontificate than was possible for Benedict XV. In his Christmas allocution to the Cardinals he enunciated a series of points which must be satisfied before peace could be restored. They were so carefully worded that they were immediately recognized as a deliberate overture to the diplomatic negotiations which were believed to have been in preparation. The Pope's statement came at the same time as a public announcement by President Roosevelt, in a letter to Archbishop Spellman of New York, that he had just appointed Mr. Myron Taylor as his personal representative to the Holy See. The coincidence was all the more significant because it had been closely preceded by statements published in the *Osservatore Romano* which emphasized the close similarity between the ideals of the Pope and of President Roosevelt. Henceforth there would therefore be not only sympathy but direct and constant consultation between the Holy See and the United States Government in every move which might lead to openings for peace. Compared with the opportunities for consultation open to Benedict XV, the new situation is obviously an immense advance. But this direct contact with Washington is only one of many such advantages gained since the last war. France restored diplomatic relations with the Vatican in the last months of Benedict's reign. Poland, which had no separate existence in 1917, is still in constant relations with the Vatican, and the Nuncio to Poland is still accredited to the exiled Polish Government now in France. And not less important is the cordial reconciliation between the Holy See and Italy. Even after the Lateran Treaty and Concordat were signed there was a certain aloofness, and the protests of Pius XI concerning interference with Catholic Action in Italy had inevitably produced a partial estrangement. But the public coronation of his successor in the Lateran Basilica and the cordial exchange of visits between the new Pope and the King of Italy have produced an atmosphere of real enthusiasm.

The arrival of President Roosevelt's two envoys in Rome under such conditions creates a situation such as

would have seemed inconceivable during Benedict's reign. It is not unreasonable to assume that the skilful and highly experienced diplomacy of the Vatican has been chiefly instrumental in creating conditions in which such strong pressure can now be brought to bear for a settlement by negotiation instead of war. The failure of Benedict's overtures in 1917 showed that an appeal by the Holy See, unsupported by any strong neutral power, could achieve very little and could only result in weakening the Vatican's capacity for intervention at a later stage. But the close relations which now have been established between the Holy See and both the United States and Italy have created a new opportunity for clarifying the war aims on both sides. Mr. Sumner Welles was more likely to receive confidences from Britain and France than from Germany, but Count Ciano should be able to obtain similar confidences from Berlin. The Vatican, with its unrivalled access to information in all countries, and not least in Germany and the countries now under German rule, has presumably done a great deal towards preparing the ground for the discussions between Mr. Welles and the belligerent governments.

Whether these diplomatic activities will be more successful than the appeals of Benedict XV remains to be seen. But the diplomatic experience of the last war has been immensely helpful, and the influence which the present Pope commands is strengthened by the fact that both he and Cardinal Maglione were among the principal agents in the peace efforts of twenty-three years ago. The obstacles are once again virtually the same as in 1917; on the one hand, the success of German aggression and the confidence of the German Government in its power to dictate its own terms, and on the other the impossibility for the Allies to make peace on terms which would be tantamount to defeat, and the distrust of all peace overtures as a possible source of division between them. But whereas both sides in 1917 believed that security could be established by military victory, the world has since learned, and has not yet forgotten, that even a victory as overwhelming as that of November 1918 achieved no lasting results and was won at the cost of

untold ruin for Europe. If the whole German people were as deeply convinced of the happiness and prosperity produced by the Nazi régime as the Nazi propagandists pretend, the prospect of successful peace negotiations would indeed be very remote. But the Catholic elements alone in Germany are sufficiently disillusioned to welcome any practical basis of peace negotiations if it can be evolved in Rome; and their grievances are still more strongly felt by the Catholics of Austria, to say nothing of Hitler's victims in Poland and Czechoslovakia.

The five points set forth by the Pope, which presumably command the full assent of the American and Italian Governments, can be summarized very briefly as requiring (1) the right to life and freedom of all nations, great and small, powerful and weak, and restitution on just principles wherever this equality of rights has been "destroyed, damaged, or endangered"; (2) mutual disarmament to free the nations from the slavery of armaments and from the menace of armed aggression; (3) the "creation or reconstitution", in the light of experience, of international institutions to guarantee fidelity to agreements and to revise those which are seen to need revision; (4) recognition of the needs and just demands of nations and peoples and racial minorities; (5) a new spirit of goodwill with "a thirst and hunger for justice and universal love". They are, in effect, a re-statement of the conditions postulated by Benedict XV in 1917. They have been put forward with less passionate eloquence than that of Benedict XV, but they are none the less inspired by the same conviction that "some other means" than war must be found if Europe is to escape the utter destruction of its civilization. The prospects of success are unquestionably improved by the fact that the Great Powers have so far abstained from attempting war in all its fury. There is still time for the peace-makers to bring great pressure to bear to prevent it by putting forward practical proposals which will command general assent, especially among the neutral countries which have up to the present suffered as severely as the belligerents.

The Pope's five points must be read in connection with his encyclical of last October when, as he wrote, "all men

were looking with terror into the abyss". He was able, as Benedict never could, to point to the recent experience of the last war in asserting that "to hope for a decisive change exclusively from the shock of war and its final issue is idle, as experience shows. The hour of victory is an hour of external triumph for the party to whom victory falls, but it is in equal measure the hour of temptation. In that hour the angel of justice strives with the demon of violence. Safety does not come to peoples from external means, from the sword, which can impose conditions of peace but does not create peace." Those words are surely a plain warning to all who still cherish the same illusion as in 1917, that the military defeat of Germany could guarantee peace in Europe. It was not for merely humanitarian motives but from the tragic experience of the last war that on the eve of war last August the Pope "considered it a duty inseparable from Our apostolic office and of Christian charity to try every means to spare mankind and Christianity the horrors of a world conflagration, even at the risk of having Our intentions and Our aims misunderstood". The conflagration has not yet leapt into flame, and the opportunity to extinguish it has not yet passed. And while the preparations for slaughter and devastation have been hastened and intensified during the autumn and winter, the same precious months have been employed in very different tasks by the Pope, who in his encyclical last October proclaimed to all the world that "whatever we can do to hasten the day when the dove of peace may find somewhere to alight on this earth submerged in a deluge of discord, We shall continue to do; trusting in those statesmen who before the outbreak of war laboured nobly to avert such a scourge from the peoples; trusting in the millions of souls of all countries and of every sphere who call not for justice alone but for love and mercy; above all, trusting in Almighty God to Whom We daily address the prayer: 'In the shadow of thy wings will I hope, until iniquity pass away.'"

DENIS GWYNN.

## HAS AMERICA BEEN ISOLATED?

**P**EOPLE sometimes speak as if American history showed a continuing tradition of abstention from all non-American disputes from the time of Washington to that of Woodrow Wilson and as if intervention in the World War was the first breach in that tradition. To what extent is that true? The writer has no desire to argue a paradox just for the sake of paradox. The desire for isolation has been strong throughout American history; it would be absurd to deny as much. Nevertheless the view that we sometimes hear advanced that the United States hardly had a foreign policy at all before the time of Wilson is certainly an exaggerated one, and it is worth while examining where and why the United States has had such a policy in the hundred and fifty years of its history.

A natural piety tries to trace back the traditional policy to the pronouncement of George Washington, but in truth Washington's principle was a somewhat different one, enunciated in different circumstances, from that of the American tradition. In Washington's day the vast Spanish-American Empire still survived. The United States was the only independent country on the American Continents, and under the circumstances abstention from entangling alliances necessarily involved abstention from any pan-American policy. For a policy towards Spanish America would necessarily have involved a policy towards Spain and thus at once the danger of entanglement in European alliances.

Nor did a suspicion of entangling alliances in these early days by any means necessarily mean a determination to have no foreign policy at all or to avoid war at all costs. If entangling alliances were to be avoided, the freedom of the seas was also to be maintained, and the determination to maintain it led the young United States into controversies both with great and small Powers—into quarrels with the pirate-ruler of Tripoli and into disputes with both French and British during the Napoleonic Wars, out of the latter of which sprang the War of 1812.

The real American tradition in foreign policy, however, springs not from Washington but from Monroe—or, to be precise, from his Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams. An attempt was made by the Holy Alliance after 1815 to preserve the peace of the world by a system of “collective security”, which would forcibly prevent not only any international war but also any internal revolution. To such an ambition opinion in the United States, herself the child of revolution, was naturally unsympathetic. When the Greeks broke out into revolt against the Turks, American sympathy with the Greeks was loudly expressed. Daniel Webster put his great rhetoric at the service of their cause, and Samuel Girdley Home joined the Insurgent ranks as a volunteer, just as did other similar enthusiasts from England and France.

Yet there could of course be little question of the United States actually intervening on the Greek side. A very different question was raised by the revolt of the Spanish-Americans against Ferdinand VII. The Powers of the Holy Alliance were suggesting the forcible reduction of the revolting colonists to their obedience. Whether in any event they would ever have been able to reduce them is highly doubtful, and at any rate it was clearly impossible for them to do so without the benevolent neutrality of Great Britain. Such neutrality was not at all likely to be forthcoming, partly owing to a genuine English dislike for the principles of the Holy Alliance, more because South America was one of the most important destinations for the stream of British capital goods which the industrial revolution was pouring on to the market. Therefore, it was certain, that, with Canning in power in Great Britain, the Spanish-Americans would in fact obtain their independence. The banishment of European government from overwhelmingly the greater part of the South American Continent created quite a new problem, which Washington had hardly envisaged. Adams and Monroe met it by the formula of the Monroe Doctrine, and the preservation of the Monroe Doctrine has of course led the United States into numerous relations with European Powers in Venezuela, Mexico, Alaska and elsewhere during the last



hundred years. American problems have admittedly been overwhelmingly the greatest concern of the foreign policy of the United States. But have they been their quite exclusive concern ?

Up till the Civil War, one might almost say, Yes. The country was still an importer of capital. There were as yet none of those demands for justice from capitalists who have put their money abroad, which make so difficult the preservation of a policy of isolation. The country had more than enough on hand in the attainment of its natural continental frontiers and in the solution of its domestic divisions. However, it is very important to understand that the tradition was a tradition of isolation not from world affairs but from European affairs. In the time of Monroe there was, it is true, no question of the United States having an Asiatic policy and therefore no need to define what that policy should be. But, when in the middle of the nineteenth century the Far East, and three-quarters of the way through that century the South Seas, first became accessible to the white man, American policy was by no means uninterested in those regions.

In the latter half of the last century the European Powers began acquiring their stations and selecting their spheres of influence in China. It is not uncommon to contrast with their conduct the American demand for the Open Door. But it must be understood that in the middle of the last century the American Government had established what was almost a protectorate over Japan. The Townsend-Harris Treaty of 1858 stated that "the President of the United States, at the request of the Japanese Government, will act as a friendly mediator in such matters of difference as may arise between the Government of Japan and any European Power". And in the last century the American Government always co-operated with other white governments, where there was a question of a common policy towards the newly emerging yellow man. It joined with the Governments of Great Britain, France and the Netherlands to force the opening of the Shimonoseki Straits in 1863 and to secure certain tariff regulations from the Japanese

Government in 1866. American sailors, acting under authority from Congress, temporarily annexed Pacific Islands from which they wished to remove guano, and in the 1880's the American flag flew over some fifty such islands.

Further south in the South Seas the Americans acquired a special status in Samoa and established there in 1878 a quasi-protectorate, not dissimilar to that which had been established in Japan twenty years before. "If unhappily," ran the treaty between the American Government and the Samoan King, "any differences should have arisen, or shall hereafter arise, between the Samoan Government and any other government in amity with the United States, the Government of the latter will employ its good offices for the purpose of adjusting those differences upon a satisfactory and solid foundation."

It was these Samoan claims of the United States which in 1889 brought the country within measurable distance of a conflict with Germany, who, then for the first time setting out on her career as a colonial Power, also had ambitions in Samoa. The Samoans appealed to the United States for protection, as they were entitled to do under the treaty, and in 1889 Germans, American and also British all sent warships to Apia. There might have been conflict, had not Providence intervened with a hurricane which wrecked all but one of the warships. The sailors, who had come prepared to fight, vied instead in rescuing one another, and the question of the Government of Samoa was compromised by the establishment of a native government under the supervision of the three Powers.

The United States had also established a substantial dominance in another Pacific Island—Hawaii—even though they had not yet annexed it. As, however, the ruling was laid down by Webster in 1843 that Hawaii was an American island—geographically speaking—the policy of the United States there may be considered as a policy of obedience to the Monroe Doctrine rather than an activity beyond the scope of it.

The end of the century saw, of course, the war with

Spain. The war arose about an American issue—the question of Cuba—and therefore cannot in itself be quoted as evidence of the interests of the United States extending beyond the boundaries of the American Continents. But the course of the war sent Dewey to the Philippines. Of course, in war the enemy must be fought wherever he may be, and such of his possessions seized as may be necessary to reduce him to peace. The capture of the Philippines as a manœuvre of war would not therefore argue American interest in the Far East. But their retention after the war does do so. It is true that it was under the circumstances by no means easy to see how the Americans could get out of the Philippines, even had they wanted to do so. But in almost all imperialistic acquisitions there is always an element of Fate. Most, if not all, of the great Empires of history have been to a large extent forced on the conquerors of them, and there have always been voices at home, protesting that the conquistadores ought to be ashamed of themselves and that it is a fatal folly for the Mother Country to undertake any new commitments. So now Andrew Carnegie in the *North American Review* wrote an article on *Distant Possessions—the Parting of the Ways*, calling in question the wisdom of the new step. And John Hay, the Secretary of State, replied to him in a private letter:

“I am not allowed to say in my present fix (ministerial responsibility) how much I agree with you. The only question in my mind is how far it is now *possible* to withdraw from the Philippines.”

It was not found possible. And the very fact that it was so widely desired and yet not found possible seemed to many observers, both American and European, a crowning proof that the feet of the United States were irrevocably set upon the path of a vigorous foreign policy. Up till now, it was argued, American energy has been absorbed in the acquisition of the frontiers of manifest destiny upon the American Continent. The country had still been an importer of capital and therefore, with adequate opportunities at home, the American capitalist had been under no temptation to push on in search of distant borrowers. But an era was passing.

In 1873 American exports for the first time exceeded her imports. By the end of the century she no longer needed to import capital. It was most probable that she would before long become an exporter of it on a considerable scale, and few doubted but that, for the United States as for other countries, the export of capital would mean a vigorous foreign policy. It was taken as demonstrated that the United States, no longer content with the American Continent, would interest herself in the Far East. The only question was whether she would interest herself in Europe as well.

Thus, under McKinley's Presidency and with Hay as Secretary of State, the United States not only prosecuted a war for the suppression of the Philippino rebellion but also, in addition to acquisitions in the Caribbean, she purchased two further Far Eastern islands, Sibu-tu and Cagayan Sulu, from Spain and annexed Hawaii and the Samoan island of Tutuila.

Hay pursued as vigorous a policy, even though it was not a policy of annexation, in China. The European Powers, having divided up among themselves the Continent of Africa, had it beyond question in their minds to divide up the other great unclaimed part of the earth—the Far East. They would have been glad enough to have taken in the United States as a partner and give to it its share of the spoils. Such, however, was not Hay's policy. Hay opposed to division the counter-policy of the Open Door—of freedom of competition for all to trade with and to develop China. Whether that policy was a wiser one than that of the European Powers is a matter for argument. The point is that it was a policy. It was far from a mere formula to justify inaction and non-intervention. It was a very positive policy, and the door was to be kept open by vigorous action against attempts to close it, whether by the more pushing of the Foreign Powers or by the Chinese themselves. Thus, at the time of the Boxer risings, the United States co-operated unhesitatingly in the international expedition for the relief of the legations (though of course, as is well known, she devoted to educational work her share of the post-war indemnity). When the

Russo-Japanese War broke out, it was fought in territory that had been recently Chinese and for Chinese prizes. If Far Eastern precedent was to go for anything, it seemed highly probable that the war would end in annexations by the victor and that other Powers would step in and help themselves to compensations on the plea of the necessity for restoration of the balance of power. Therefore, anticipating trouble, Hay, while the war was still on, obtained promises from all other Powers that they would make no territorial claims against China. Then, to prevent both sides from fighting themselves to exhaustion, Theodore Roosevelt, who had by now succeeded to the Presidency on McKinley's assassination, offered himself as mediator and arranged the Peace Treaty of Portsmouth. After the peace Elihu Root, who had succeeded Hay as Secretary of State, obtained the accession of victorious Japan to the American principle of the Open Door in China. "The policy of both Governments," ran a declaration of the two Governments, "uninfluenced by any aggressive tendencies, is directed to the maintenance of the existing *status quo* in the region above mentioned, and to the defence of the principle of equal opportunity for commerce and industry in China." American relations with Japan and China were, it is true, very largely concerned with the domestic question of Oriental immigration into the United States. But there was also very definitely an American policy in the Far East—the policy of the Open Door.

It was not then unreasonable if the foreign observer, in the early years of this century, thought that the day of American isolation, if there ever had been such a day, was past and only asked whether the United States, playing a vigorous part in Asiatic politics, would be prepared to play a vigorous part also in the politics of Europe. So long as Theodore Roosevelt was President, there seemed some reason to think that it would. Admiral Mahan had impressed upon Americans both the general importance of sea-power in history and the necessity of a large navy to uphold expanding American interests. And Theodore Roosevelt soon showed that his inter-

vention to mediate the Russo-Japanese War was by no means going to be an isolated exception to a general rule of non-interference. He talked at large of the necessity of an Anglo-German-American alliance to check the rising power of Japan. The proposal was not a practicable one, since the British were themselves at the time allied with the Japanese and since the German naval programme constituted a threat to the British which made intimate relations between them and the Germans hardly a possibility. Yet, when that project was still-born, Roosevelt intervened as mediator of Franco-German differences in Morocco, where American interests were of the smallest, and he finally concluded his presidency with the characteristic gasconade of sending the American fleet round the world in order to impress the Japanese. His policy in Panama, though it betrayed itself as the product of the same temperament, is outside the scope of this study.

There was in the years before the war a growing body of international agreements on almost every topic under the sun from the Hague Court downwards. In such internationalism the United States played her full part, and, so far from her record being one of isolation, there are five hundred pages in the *Treaties, Conventions, International Acts, etc.*, published in 1913, which record the international obligations into which the United States had entered before the World War.

The real question then is not, as is sometimes asked, Why was a tradition of a hundred and fifty years broken in 1917? There was no single tradition of a hundred and fifty years. The circumstances of Washington were different from the circumstances of Monroe, those of Monroe different from those of Cleveland, those of Cleveland again different from those of Theodore Roosevelt, and each President very properly shaped a new policy with which to meet the new circumstances. The real question is the smaller question, Why was an attempt made under Taft and Wilson to check a development of more and more interference to which the country seemed to be logically headed, under McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt?

The answer to that question surely is that the circum-



stances changed again during those years. Theodore Roosevelt liked to play an aggressive part in international politics, but he had no thought that America would thus become involved in a World War. He played an aggressive part simply because in the first years of the century there was no danger of a World War. There was always a possibility of a European War between the French and German groups, but, so long as Great Britain remained detached from both groups, a World War was hardly possible. It was hardly possible because Great Britain would not herself intervene on the Continent, while, with her complete naval predominance, no Continental Power could attack her even if it wanted to do so. With the German naval challenge to Great Britain and Great Britain's consequent entente with France, a general war became from the second half of the first decade of the twentieth century a possibility. The temperament of Taft was doubtless one that could more easily adapt itself to an unadventurous foreign policy than that of Theodore Roosevelt. But, apart from the contrasted temperaments of the two Presidents, there was a new set of circumstances which demanded a new policy. A field, in which it had been safe to play a few years before, had suddenly become dangerous. It was wise to attempt to withdraw from it.

The events of today have presented statesmen with yet a new set of circumstances, and they again have been met with a new policy. It is idle to pretend that modern American policy in China is based upon the principles of Secretary Hay. The traditional Far Eastern policy of the United States was a policy of the Open Door in China and the use of force, if necessary, to keep it open. It would have demanded an active assistance of China today against Japanese aggression. In saying this, the writer does not mean to demand that such a policy should be pursued today. In the Far East as elsewhere new circumstances have arisen—the unexpected rise of a Great Yellow Power, the nature of the Russian régime and so on—and it is right again to face new circumstances with a new policy. The writer in this article is not concerned to attack or to defend any policy, whether of the

past or of the present. He is concerned only to demonstrate that it is a dangerous oversimplification to imagine that American foreign policy over a hundred and fifty years has been dictated by slavish obedience to a single formula. On the contrary, it has been as complex and shifting as that of any Power, and it is as little possible to understand it without the labour of detailed study.

CHRISTOPHER HOLLIS.

### BROTHER JUNIPER

I know a little roadside tree  
Who's "Brother Juniper" to me.  
No storm has ever daunted him :  
He stands there, pious but not prim,  
His top branch like some comic hat  
That points to Heaven in spite of that !

A begging friar there he stands,  
His lowest boughs like beckoning hands  
And though swift cars may offer . . . dust  
He bears that as good friars must  
Still holding out his urgent palms  
Serene though shabby, asking alms.

A very perfect link he seems  
'Twixt earthly cares and Heavenly dreams  
As, head held high and roots deep laid,  
He waits, gay, pious, undismayed,  
That lovesome ludicrous small tree  
Who's "Brother Juniper" to me !

ETHEL TALBOT.

## FOR GOD AND SPAIN

**T**HE magnificent gesture of 20 May, 1939, the Year of Victory, when General Francisco Franco Bahamonde laid down his sword at the feet of the Christ of Lepanto in St. Barbara's, Madrid, was symbolic of the sense of responsibility the Caudillo may well feel as he faces the welter of problems that confront him in the building of the New Spain. The work already undertaken was fully recognized and the tasks awaiting him were abundantly foreshadowed in the prayer that accompanied the gesture :

"Lord, graciously accept the offering of this people that with me and for Thy name has heroically conquered the enemies of truth, who were blind. Lord God, in whose hands are all justice and all power, grant me Thy help to lead this people to the full liberty of Empire for Thy glory and that of the Church.

"Lord, that all men may know Jesus, Who is the Christ, the Son of the living God."

It was obvious that as the Nationalist cause advanced it had to organize life in the territory won over to it, for the more urgent problems needed at least temporary solutions and could not be left until victory was secured ; and so reforms were gradually outlined and decrees became immediately operative to effect improvements in the social and economic, the religious and educational order in Spain. Since the end of the conflict, those reforms have been gradually extended to the whole of the vast territory of Spain, and progressive revision of the original decrees, with those modifications and improvements which experience has shown to be advisable, has been made.

The parts of the country which had borne the Marxist yoke until the last moment were in a state of ruin : anarchy in social life and the chaotic condition of their material resources were their negative contribution to the resurrection of a suffering and morally martyred nation. The gold reserves of the Bank of Spain had been dilapidated and in those parts of the country under Nationalist

rule every nerve was being strained and all resources directed towards the achievement of victory. Social, industrial and economic life was so completely upset that nothing short of complete reorganization and reconstruction could restore it to anything like normal conditions. Some headway with this work had already been made before 1939, but its progress was impeded by a shortage of labour, since man-power was needed in the army. The present war in Europe is having its inevitable repercussions on the industries and on the trade of non-belligerent countries, for with nations as with individuals, none lives to himself alone: this is particularly true of Spain, who needs certain commodities from abroad and markets from which to buy and in which to sell, and who finds her trading possibilities in some measure restricted.

One of the first and biggest difficulties to be faced was the balancing of the trade budget. The deficit in this in 1914 was between a hundred and a hundred and fifty million pesetas, a sum diminished to a certain extent by the money that flowed into Spain from Spanish America. Spain's policy of neutrality in the Great War proved beneficent in that from having a deficit, her trade balance showed a credit of seven hundred million pesetas, an improvement effected between 1915 and 1919. But within the ensuing eleven years the advantages of this were lost and by 1930 a deficit of six hundred million pesetas again marked her budget. This was reduced by more than half, to two hundred and fifty million pesetas, between 1931 and 1935, and seemed like a beneficent effect of the proclamation of the Republic. The advantage was more apparent than real, for the reduction of the deficit was paralleled by a reduction in national output and by a decrease in trade, which slowed down to about 50 per cent of what it had been in the previous period. The Nationalist Government has attributed this constant deficit to the fear of various governments of facing up to the study of the root causes and to the half-hearted attempts they have made to deal with them. The New Spain rightly feels it a matter of the most urgent necessity and a central point in her economy

to wipe out the deficit and to prevent, as far as possible, its recurrence. Representing as it does the difference between imports and exports, she hopes to solve the difficulty by diminishing the former, suppressing all but indispensable imports, and increasing the latter. Spain is such a huge country and so rich in natural resources that she has the possibility of producing at home much of what she formerly imported. For essential imports, she hopes to make greater use of Spanish shipping than she has hitherto done.

The more quickly to render Spain more self-dependent and to help the agricultural producer to exploit to the full every type of crop, she will provide technical education for him, so that his theoretical knowledge of the soil and its resources and improved methods of farming may, when put into practice, produce a greater yield. To make his work worth while, she is stabilizing and fixing the prices of chief products and so assuring to the farmer a minimum rate of profit in conformity with prevailing agricultural conditions and at the same time ensuring that the farm labourer gets a living wage and reasonable living conditions. The standard of living of the rural population has been low; in addition to improving hygienic and housing conditions under which villagers and countryfolk have hitherto lived, a progressive attempt is being made to make every family in the country in a measure self-supporting by the provision of a strip of land or a garden, to encourage them to grow their own food-stuffs.

The State will assure to farmers stability for the cultivation of the land by means of long-term contracts which will guarantee them against unjustified dispossession and will secure them the inalienable right to the improvements they effect on the farm. It is the aspiration of the State to find means to bring it about that the land, on just terms, may ultimately belong to those who exploit it.

That the production of food-stuffs was already in hand was apparent as early as August 1939, for although from the Le Pertus frontier, the road to Barcelona lies at first through large tracts of land not under cultivation, with

here and there traces of terraced vineyards and olive trees left to themselves, nearer Figueras little strips of land began to appear, already green with crops and garden produce set and growing. Help analagous to that given to the small-holder is extended to fishermen, to enable them to buy at reasonable rates all the tackle and equipment they require in the exercise of their calling, and to prevent depreciation so that their catches will sell at a just profit.

The remaking of roads—those of the North are good, save near towns where shells have done some damage—and the rebuilding of bridges are well in hand and will absorb some labour, as will the reconstruction of buildings in cities damaged in the war. In parenthesis it may be noted that of damage by bombardment in Barcelona one had to admit that military objectives seem to have been the targets. Buildings so destroyed, despite the fortress overhanging the harbour, had, with two exceptions (and those in rows of tenements near the port), been Government buildings in corner blocks. In every case the port and the buildings round it had been aimed at. Street fighting had raged round the taking and defending of public buildings, strategic points. Of the churches we shall make later mention.

The reorganization of legislation on labour and on the rights of workmen is Nationalist and Syndicalist in conception; it is based on the three watchwords: *Fatherland, Bread and Justice*, and animated by humane sentiments and the Catholic tradition of social justice. It is Nationalist in that it seeks to make labour serve the whole country and syndicalist "as a reaction against Liberal capitalism and Marxist materialism". Defining work as a duty imposed by God on man to enable him to fulfil his destiny as a man and for the good of his country, the New Spain is striving to inculcate in all Spaniards a sense of the dignity of work and a sense of the dignity of him who does it: she is striving to induce an attitude to work which makes all men see it as a social duty which the State has a right to expect of every man and woman and as a social right of which they may, in their turn,



demand satisfaction of the State. To emphasize this interpretation of work it has been decreed that 18 July, the anniversary of the Nationalist rising, shall be observed each year as the feast of the *Exaltation of Work*.

Generally speaking, the State will not be a direct employer of labour, except where private initiative fails or in the event of the best interests of the nation making this rôle imperative. Because private ventures are a fruitful source of economic life for the nation and because, subject to the supreme rights of the nation as interpreted by the State, man has a right to private property, the right to launch and keep up enterprises is left to individuals or to companies, on the understanding that capital is to be considered an instrument of production and that the director or manager of a business concern shall be directly responsible to the State. Just interest on capital is considered the legitimate measure of private profit for the business and any excess over that amount goes to form necessary reserves for the business and to better the conditions and raise the standard of living of the employees, provided always that business interests are subordinated to national welfare and national interests, which must take precedence. All forms of usury are proscribed by express order of the State, which also fixes bases for regulating the relations between employers and employed, both with regard to working conditions and wages and to their reciprocal duties. While it is expected of the employer that his help and protection shall be at the service of his employees, with whom his dealings must be open and loyal, he has a right, in return, to see the work the latter have contracted to do carried out faithfully. Any differences that may arise are brought to a special Work Tribunal to be solved. All workers, technicians and members of the Liberal professions are to form Unions, based on the threefold conception of Unity, Totality and Hierarchy. It is the business of the union to make the problems of production its own and to propose solutions. A second function is that it shall see to the interests of its members and ensure that each of them gets work in conformity with his capabilities and deserts, primary consideration always

being given to ex-soldiers. Through the Syndicate the State will secure just economic conditions, security of tenure and continuity of employment to the members who have to be kept informed by their employers of the progress of the production in which they are all engaged. The idea behind this measure is to give them a more vital interest in the work as a whole, to stimulate their interest in it and to incite them to further efforts.

All workers in Spain must have an annual holiday with pay, and opportunities for recreation and amusements, as well as educational facilities. Sunday work, work on holidays of obligation and on civil holidays, save in cases of real need, is prohibited, and on days when workmen's attendance at Nationalist ceremonies is ordered, they are to be released to attend, without being penalized in any way. Not only must wages be just, but they must be sufficiently high to provide the worker and his family with the wherewithal to live a decent, moral life: a system of family allowances helps towards this end, since the family is the fundamental, the primary natural institution and of the utmost importance to the well-being of the nation. Women and children cannot be employed on night work, and the conditions of work executed in the home, where, for example, in order to be able to look after her family, a woman contracts to do sewing, tailoring and the like, are regulated on the same lines as those that obtain in factories.

The insurance system covers widows, invalids, maternity benefit, accidents at work, cases where a man becomes incapacitated, through tuberculosis and the like, and assures the possibility of retirement on a reasonably adequate pension. In that production is viewed as a national thing and the economic system as a unity, with employers and employees all engaged, as it were, on a single enterprise, it becomes the care and duty and interest of every Spaniard to defend, improve and develop it. And therefore any individual or any group of individuals who disturb the tenor of normal production, spoil its rhythm or ruin it, must of necessity be looked upon as enemies of the State and dealt with accordingly; they do effectively declare themselves enemies of the

community and in self defence the community has a right to protect itself against them, for it is the duty of the State to prevent disloyal competition and any upsetting of the national economy.

We have already seen that the whole trend of Spain's economic policy is to encourage initiative and a sense of personal responsibility in all who make their contribution to it, that is, in every national, man and woman. The programme of the New State has been expressed as :

To conceive human work in its exact function of right and duty as the privilege of every man to affirm by his own effort his life's destiny, its dignity and broadness, and as a permanent need of the country to obtain from all her children acts of service for the resolute maintenance of national life and for the realization of her Imperial vocation.

The growing realization that privileges bring duties in their train and that, whereas most men can fulfil their obligations by compulsory military service, justice demands that direct opportunities for service be extended to a greater number than those liable each year to be called up for military training. Indeed, the rising anew of Spain depends on the measure of collaboration of each of her individual members. Therefore women have their part to play as well as men and service was first officially asked of them in 1937, not under penalties, but as an act of generous sacrifice, that they might do their share in alleviating the sufferings occasioned then, both among soldiers and among the civilian population, by the war, and now, that they may help to succour the distress of the post-war period. Placed under the control of *Auxilio Social* (see below) of the Traditionalist Spanish Phalange, the movement for the *Social Service* of women between the ages of 17 and 35 excepts those already in the Civil Service, in administrative posts, in social Institutions, or those already possessing professional qualifications, all of whom are looked upon as having fulfilled their obligation ; those also are excepted who, by reason of some physical defect or infirmity, are incapable of service ; the exemption finally extends to married

women or widows, so long as they have one or more sons, in virtue of whose services past, present or to come, they may be freed from their obligation, and to women who gave service in hospitals and elsewhere during the war.

Social Service, without the performance of which no degrees or professional qualifications will in future be granted and without the performance of which no public function may be exercised, lasts for six months, either as one period or spread over three years in units of at least one month; it is given in the Province in which the woman resides, unless she herself, in making her application, expressly states that she prefers to serve elsewhere. During her period of service she works through a cycle of duties of various kinds, simple nursing, tending refugees, and so on, tasks calculated to make her realize her obligations to Society. If she is obliged to live away from home and needs financial assistance, *Auxilio Social* comes to her aid; the organization also provides special hostels for this class of workers or finds them accommodation in approved hostels run by other bodies. But in as far as possible, the woman must live on her own means or with the help of the assistance her parents and relations can give her. Her post, in what may be termed civilian life, must, in the meantime, be kept open for her. During the period of service she is subject to the disciplinary regulations of the officers of *Auxilio Social* and infractions of orders, indiscipline, inaptitude and unseemly conduct are punishable by a prolongation of service for anything up to a month and by the withholding of the certificate and badge whose award terminates the period.

Although the cost of living in Spain is high, for ordinary food, not merely for luxuries, and despite disorganization consequent on war, the difficulty of communications (a notice in the General Post Office in Barcelona announced the resumption of postal service throughout Spain three months after the victory), the scarcity of small change, replaced by stamps, themselves hard to get in smaller values (and poor in quality), the atmosphere of Barcelona itself was a happy, busy one: in the morning

hours, at noon in the business quarters, among the crowds along the *Ramblas* at eventide, in the animation of the market at night, amid flaring gas-jets, the dominant impression was one of a people with a purpose, glad to be about its achieving, and freed of the fear and horror of war. In that same market there were brisk sales of almost innumerable kinds of fish in great round, wheel-like baskets, fruit, vegetables, fowl sold in portions to make it more accessible to modest purses; meat alone was scarce, but plentiful supplies of groceries and an abundance of good, inexpensive wine were some compensation.

Unforgettable was the inauguration of the Plaza Monumental on a Sunday afternoon, in the presence of the Governor and Commander of the 4th Division. Beneath the blue-grey of a storm-threatening sky, and against the rising tiers of very grey stone round the arena, the general tone effect of all that vast throng was a love-in-the-mist blue. The impressive effect of unity at the playing of the National Anthem and of that huge concourse standing with hands raised, the perfect discipline of body, a striking figure of what the disciplined soul of a united nation may be, centred round a common ideal, were summed up in the volleyed cry of *Arriba España*. On the expert attention with which the frequenters of the bull-fight follow and appreciate every movement, every step, every stroke, in their sporting determination to see that the bull gets his due chance, on the pitiless promptitude with which they hiss every false thrust of the torador, every attempt to overcome the bull by unfair means, there is no need to dwell.

But if it is true that Barcelona, in spite of all, gives the impression of a prosperous city, or at least of one on the road to new prosperity, not every part of Spain has been so fortunate, and it is here that *Auxilio Social* steps in and comes to the relief of those in need. Might it not be likened, in the sphere of humanity and philanthropy in its general, all-embracing character, to Catholic Action in the spiritual order, indeed a manifestation of it? One's mind flies back to the long blue posters on hoardings, with their exhortation, alongside the six loosely-bound arrows, to buy a blue ticket (a little subscription to the

funds of *Auxilio Social*) "if you have felt the sorrow of humanity in your heart", and also to the flag-day which gave everyone a chance to subscribe his mite and let none escape.

Many private and State organizations and institutions exist for the relief of the poor ; there are homes for the aged, run by the townships or by social organizations. *Auxilio Social* provides free meals for the very poor and for orphans : help for the poor and destitute is, indeed, one of its numerous works, and members, some during their period of Social Service, give to the lonely and especially to refugee children a little compensation for the love and care that had gone out of their lives. Another of its activities during the war was that of looking after the dependents of soldiers. By rigorous investigation, it strove to prevent help being given in cases where it was not needed, the better to provide for the really destitute. The money for allocations was collected from a special tax per head and from taxes on various luxuries : twenty per cent on tobacco, drinks, wireless sets, cameras, perfume, luxury articles, expensive furniture, entertainments, visits to the hairdresser, games and games equipment, furs, brocades of the better qualities, objets d'art, antiques, porcelain, gold, precious stones ; ten per cent on wireless licences, motor coaches and on all food other than necessities. Special taxes on dwelling houses, visas, on industry ; fifty per cent of the saving effected on the day only one dish is allowed and the total proceeds of the *Sin postre* days, when in private houses and in hotels, people voluntarily deprive themselves of dessert or sweet.

Prison reform became, during the Civil War, a matter of some urgency : the taking of prisoners of war brought with it the problem of their occupation and keep and focussed attention on the need for reviewing the attitude of the community, not only to this type of prisoner, but also to the criminal, in the light of a study of the cause of his delinquency, its nature, and, where possible, the remedy to be applied in order that the offender might be reintegrated into society. Referring to the whole



great problem of delinquency, General Franco said, in January 1939 :

"Statistics here are striking ; the seriousness and deep-rootedness of delinquency give food for long and continual meditation. Two equally grave preoccupations have always engaged my mind on this point. On the one hand, my constant care is to preserve life and to succour the souls of all Spaniards capable today or tomorrow of loving their country, of working and struggling for her, of adding their grain of sand to the common effort. If we respect the tree and the flowers because they represent riches and true delight, how shall we not esteem and respect the existence of a Spaniard ? On the other hand, without taking precautions, it is not possible to restore to society, or, if we may say so, to social circulation, harmful, perverted elements to spread political and moral poison, because their return to the free, normal communion of Spaniards would be no more and no less than the danger of corruption and contagion for all, even the historical ruin of victory won by such great sacrifice.

"I feel that there are at present in Spain two types of delinquents : those whom we may call hardened criminals, whom it is impossible to reclaim for human order, and those capable of true repentance, those who can be redeemed and adapted to patriotic, social life. As for the first, they must not return to society ; they must be removed from it to expiate their guilt as happens throughout the world with this class of criminals. As for the second, we are bound so to order things that their redemption is made possible. How ? By means of work. This implies a complete transformation of the penal system, from which I hope much. Redemption by work seems to me to correspond to a profoundly Christian sentiment and an unimpeachable social orientation. Prisons will not be dreary Moorish dungeons nor places of drudgery ; workshops of definite types will be set up and each reclaimable delinquent shall choose the activity most to his liking. After a certain time, according to the reports made on each prisoner, they may return to the bosom of their families, in a state of conditional and supervised freedom. If their conduct so observed gives proof of the sincerity of their amendment and the reality of their incorporation into patriotic duty, that liberty shall become complete and permanent ; if they fall back again into criminal ways, they will go back to the prison workshops."

This conception of the redemptive aspect of prison work, new to Spain, involves an inquiry into the charges on

which all prisoners at present incarcerated have been condemned, a consideration, and, in certain cases, a modification of the sentences imposed, since justice must be the primary consideration in the working of this new scheme and equitable and not excessive punishment is postulated as a basis of the reform. The conception of their employment puts them—with necessary and deserved restrictions—on a footing similar to that of all Spaniards: that is, that work is a right and a duty. When the system was inaugurated prisoners of war were allowed to work in uniform and were treated as military men. The work done in prison workshops is paid at the rate of two pesetas a day, of which seventy-five per cent is retained for the keep of the prisoner; if he is a married man and his wife has no visible means of support, he is paid four pesetas a day, and one peseta is added for each child under fifteen years of age. Families who have only this sum for their total income would starve and so *Auxilio Social* comes to their aid and makes a grant for as long as the incarceration of the prisoner endures. Prisoners are supplied with books and papers, and lectures on all subjects, politics not excluded, are given in the prison. Nor are their religious interests neglected.

The Nationalist State, in condemning a criminal to reclusion, has no intention of condemning him to excessive and exhausting work, nor to physical and intellectual inaction and will do all that lies in its power to procure him work in every respect like that done by free citizens and to encourage his moral and spiritual development through the medium of reading and instruction.

When a man is released on probation he can be employed alongside his fellow-citizens, so long as preference has been given by the employer to free men. This last provision is strictly in conformity with the dictates of justice and the whole idea of the gradual reabsorption of a man from prison into society is an excellent one: it makes a bold attempt to deal with the sometimes insuperable difficulties of a man who, after a lapse, finds it difficult, if not impossible, to live down the past, save thanks to philanthropy. Here there is no philanthropy, but a direct effort of the State to meet a re-

sponsibility and so safeguard a man's self-respect. It is, moreover, viewing prison and detention generally as corrective and not merely punitive: therefore, as constructive. The formation of penal colonies for work in mines, railway construction and road-making, the damming of rivers, the draining of marshes, the making of canals and afforestation in Spain and in her colonies, with the men living in camps, is under discussion. The putting into operation of this widened scheme will increase the possibilities and meet the special needs of more and more men.

The organization of the work of prisoners, their preparation for it, the distribution of family allowances and the proposal to ransom sentence by work may serve as a foundation and an opportunity for an extensive and fruitful work of spiritual, cultural, patriotic and social improvement, which will make a great contribution to the decisive conquest for God and for the Fatherland of thousands of souls that have been misled.

Underlying the legislation and informing the social and economic policy of Spain we thus see the directives of Catholic principles. Nor is this to be wondered at: the recognition of the interweaving of Catholicism with Spain's greatness in the past calls forth logically a return to Catholic principles if a restoration of that greatness is to be the goal of the future. Has not the Caudillo truly declared: "It is well known that in our country there is but one religious confession, which the centuries have made stand out in bold relief and that is the Catholic religion, the inspirer of her genius and tradition." The grant of fifty to sixty million pesetas for public worship and for the clergy, formerly made by the State, was suppressed during the Republican era and clergy and churches became the private concern of the faithful. In October 1939, that grant was restored and one is obliged to admit that all the available funds will be required for the rebuilding of churches, and for making good some of the damage done by the Red Terror. Gazing on the various churches of Barcelona, not one of which had escaped unscathed, though the Cathedral with its cloisters and fountain has suffered less than most

of the others, one recalled, with some little irony, the assurance of an English Socialist colleague, who, at Easter, in 1937, went to Barcelona to offer her services for a brief period to the Red authorities, that all the churches were open. They were open, indeed, to heaven. Every one was burnt from within, so that many have only charred walls and black ruins where once side-altars stood. Not even the unfinished *Sagrada Familia*, so like a huge fantastic model in some plastic medium, escaped the general fate. We may, by the very nature of the charge, dismiss as spurious that made by certain French Socialists, whose informants are the permanent Catalan refugees, that "certain churches had been transformed into fortresses by Franco's followers. That is why there was fighting in them; not one was burnt by the people, except those taken by assault and destroyed by the artillery." There never was a war when similar charges were not made.

In some churches the fire has burnt through the very roof; the presbyteries have been destroyed. We had nearly reached *San Pablo*, the oldest church and the only example of a Romanesque church in the city, and inquired of a passer-by: "Where is *San Pablo*?" His hands, spread eloquently, completed what his lips conveyed: "Eh, it stood there!" The people of Barcelona looked happy and purposeful, yes! only in the eyes of the clergy is there the stark shadow haunting men who have looked on death and whose soul has not lost the memory of it. However ruined the churches, almost innumerable Masses succeed each other at an improvised High Altar, remarkable for its simple beauty and immaculate cleanliness. Since the war, returns show that a larger number of people go to Mass now and many more frequent the Sacraments, and this throughout Spain, although, naturally enough, the increase is more marked in some regions than in others. Personal impressions are that although the attendance of men is large, women are in the majority, that great veneration and much respect and courtesy is shown to nuns and yet, that in at least one instance, a special collection for the rebuilding of the Seminary evoked little general interest and many people made no

contribution, perhaps a necessary reaction to the restoration of the State grant, for the great increase in vocations to the priesthood in Spain is a witness against the interpretation of indifference.

The diocesan rule about the suitability of women's clothing is framed with dignity and posted up in every church; only its interpretation is left in the hands of a poor *dévoté* at the church door, and without discrimination she assumes the responsibility of deciding who shall hear Mass and who shall not. Thus one insisted that without a mantilla and in a costume subsequently pronounced by a priest to be perfectly fitting, a well-dressed Italian woman could not, in the interests of *la moralidad*, enter the House of God. The spirit of the Bishops' ruling, basing itself on the dignity of the Church and appealing to a woman's personal dignity, is admirable and with it no one will disagree, but one cannot help reflecting that the censorship committed to or assumed by people of immature judgment will do more harm than good and sow more seeds of anticlericalism in a soil trying to rid itself of them.

The effort of the clergy may well be concentrated on so instructing their people that they become really informed Catholics and Catholics whose public and private life is guided and nourished by their religion, rather than remaining men and women who for traditional or social reasons, or for no thought-out reason, give adherence. While avoiding generalizations that carry with them their own disabilities, it may well be that among priests in the past there was some negligence in teaching and preaching. The vigour of Catholic Action among them and the purification by suffering of the last few years may well increase the number of those truly apostolic priests who have, nonetheless, never been lacking in Spain. Their task will be a gigantic one, for their numbers have been so reduced by martyrdom. It will be recalled that the last Pastoral Letter of Cardinal Goma, Archbishop of Toledo and Primate of Spain, was suppressed by the Civil Authorities. Placing oneself from the standpoint of the Government, one understands to some extent the reason for the suppression, since,

quite apart from the question of good taste, tact and gratitude to those who have liberated the Church in Spain and freed her from a reign of terror, its tone seems to be one of carping criticism of the results rather than of the deficiencies in those primarily responsible for those results. Much more emphasis appears to be placed by the Cardinal on the rights of the hierarchy than on their debt to those Civil Powers whose imperfect Catholicism he deplures, without attributing the blame to his clergy whose duty it must certainly be to form their public as their private conscience. Perhaps inadvertently, but unguardedly in a public pronouncement, the Pastoral contained much that might be understood as implied criticism of the present relations between Church and State in Spain and in addition much direct, unveiled discontent: "There is one necessary thing lacking in the majority of citizens today, and that is the formation of the Catholic conscience for its effect upon citizenship. Not only the masses, but in some cases those who direct public affairs suffer from this deficiency. It is doing enormous harm as a result of ignorance rather than of intentional malice."

Legitimate as it is to quote an encyclical in a Pastoral, one may, perhaps, question the aptness of the words chosen on this occasion, those of Pius XI about the freedom of every Catholic to prefer one form of Government to another, "and to work for the triumph of any political ideal provided that he uses legal and honest means and shows respect for the constituted authority".

Perhaps an idea of the approximate salaries paid to priests by the State may be useful in judging at least one aspect of the relations between Church and State. Country clergy receive 1750 pesetas a year, clergy of the rank and file 2000 pesetas; those in charge of large parishes between 3000 and 3500 pesetas; the Dean of a large cathedral, 4000 pesetas, the canons 3000 and Bishops 20,000 to 25,000 pesetas: Archbishops an increase on these latter sums.

We have already seen the place of Catholic ideals in the economic system and in social life, and in education,



with its restoration to power and activity of the teaching Orders, we note the same thing. Having restored religion to its rightful place in all Secondary Education, the Government, by a decree of 1 August, 1939, placed the teaching of religion in all Secondary Schools, Government and Private Schools, under the direct control of the Bishop of the diocese wherein each school is situated.

Spain, who today, more than ever, values her glorious title of Catholic, proclaims the sovereignty of the Church in matters of religion and fully recognizes to their Lordships the Bishops the right, inherently theirs, to teach in their respective dioceses; by their divine mission and competency, they must arrange, control and give heed to Christian teaching and life in all Secondary Schools.

The working out of any scheme devised is regarded, however, as provisional, since too premature fixing of conditions may make future necessary readjustments harder to bring about. The Bishops are asked to submit nominees for the post of teachers of religion in Secondary Schools; if the candidates present reasonable guarantees to the Ministry of Education, they are appointed and become teachers under the same disciplinary conditions as those who give instruction in any other subject, and at a salary of 4000 pesetas, or half the sum for Junior masters. The censure of religious text-books for Secondary Schools devolves on the Bishops, as also does the choice of those to be introduced into the schools and the regulating of the prices the pupil may be expected to pay for them, just as all text-books now in circulation for other subjects and all future editions must be examined by a Government Commission, which also fixes prices. As a measure of expediency and to tide over a shortage of Elementary School teachers, the parish priest of a village may also be the village schoolmaster, precedence being given to his sacerdotal duties should they and his teaching functions clash.

In the past rather less than twenty-five per cent of Spanish children between the ages of six and fourteen managed to evade the "compulsory" attendance at Primary Schools required by law, with the result that a

like proportion at least of the adult population is illiterate. That this evasion in the past has created difficulties in the present is indubitable and it is one of the cares of the New Spain to remedy in so far as in her lies the shortcomings of the past among those who have suffered because of them, and to prevent a continuation of the slackness that rendered such a state of things possible. To that end, by evening classes held in the buildings of the Primary Schools, by special lectures and cultural Missions, the Government seeks to interest the average adult in an order of ideas with which he may have little or no acquaintance. By giving the parents, mothers and fathers, a direct interest in the education of their own and other people's children, both through giving them representation on the various types of Education Committees, local, municipal or provincial, and by making awards to the parents who show most zeal in co-operating with the authorities and give proof of interest in the progress of their children's studies, in such ways is a large proportion of the more mature adult population brought into direct contact with direct educational influences.

If we can argue from the good done in many English homes through first-hand contact with Nursery Schools and their ideals, we may augur well from this bringing together of parent and school. Moreover, this interest and co-operation of the parent is vital, if the urgently needed reform of primary education is ever to become a working reality. The physical, mental, moral and spiritual welfare of the child are all basic considerations in the formulation of the new scheme and to raise the standard of teaching, courses in various subjects and in method, and educational facilities of every imaginable kind are afforded to members of the profession. Methods of recompensing them for hard work, zeal and keenness suggest that in the past some slackness has been allowed to creep in.

Special regulations govern primary education in Navarre, where the first step taken was the making of a census of the child population, with each child's date of birth and the profession and address of his father duly entered. Although between three and seven, a

child there can attend a Nursery School, he has no obligation to begin his school life before the age of five and during his last year he is prepared for his first Holy Communion. In places where no Nursery Schools exist, the age limits of attendance in Primary Schools are between six and fourteen, reduced to five in places that have less than forty scholars in the school, and, except in the capital of Navarre, a child may leave school at the age of ten. If obliged to stay on, between ten and twelve, he has to spend eight months of the year at school and six months between twelve and fourteen, the months being fixed at the same time for all.

The needy are, with the permission of the Local Authority, allowed to do some work outside school hours in order to earn a little money. Fines of fifteen pesetas for five absences of their children are imposed upon the parents, who are, however, rewarded, when they are poor people, if their children attend school regularly. In larger villages and towns, places with over 1000 inhabitants, a guard is appointed to see that children are respectful of persons and property, that they do not smoke and that they refrain from using bad language.

Educational reforms are not confined to Primary Schools, since the Secondary School system is in process of complete reconstruction. Here, the emphasis is placed on a good all-round education, a thorough grounding, over an extended period (now seven years), in a full complement of subjects, prior to the study of those that have a vocational trend. To teach the adolescent how to live his life, spiritual, mental and physical, rather than how to earn a living is, in a sense, the keynote of the new scheme. This the New Spain is striving to secure by opening up to all youth in Secondary Schools the richness of classical antiquity and of Spanish literary and historical tradition, as well as giving adequate time to Modern Languages, Mathematics, Science and practical subjects. Religion, covering a wide syllabus, is an integral part of the course from the first year to the last, in State and Private Schools : against the latter there is no discrimination ; they conform to the same standards as the former and enjoy the same rights and privileges. Public examina-

tions have become completely independent of the Secondary School, in that they are no longer arranged by the teaching Staffs of the schools, and so have greater value. All Primary and Secondary Education in State Schools is free (save for a nominal yearly registration fee in the latter). Private Secondary Schools fix their own fees but can only take seventy-five per cent fee-payers: the free places are reserved for war orphans and other needy children.

When the new plan for real teaching is applied, and decisively and progressively assimilated, there will have taken place the most far-reaching revolution that Spanish education has known in this last century. Spain, whose authentic cultural self is being born anew, is reassuming her mission, by her example, by her militant and heroic strength, and will be able to count on her youth through their active and efficacious system of education, whose work it is to train the souls of Spaniards in those virtues of our great military and political leaders of the Golden Age, formed by the Catholic Theology of the Council of Trent, by the humanities of the Renaissance and victories on land and sea for the defence and spreading of Spanish influence.

MINA J. MOORE.

## THE FOREIGN POLICY OF UNITED

ITALY 1861-1939

**W**HEN three months before his death Cavour addressed the first Parliament of United Italy there had occurred in the European firmament a revolution comparable to that which took place in the history of astronomy on the discovery of the planet Uranus. As a sixth planet was added to the five hitherto known to dwellers on the earth, so a sixth European Power was added to the existing quintet. The new sister was the most fragile member of the family and for a time Italy held only courtesy rank as a great power. The foreign policy of United Italy falls into three phases. During the first its object was the completion of the unity which had been substantially achieved; during the second it was directed towards preserving what had been acquired. The third phase has been of an expansionist character. A state which included Turin, Genoa, Milan, Bologna, Florence, Perugia, Ancona and Naples on the mainland and the island appanages of Sicily and Sardinia might indeed be called the Kingdom of Italy. But the presence of an Austrian garrison in Venice and a French one in Rome left unity incomplete. At first it was hoped that these cities might be incorporated into the new state without recourse to arms. Years earlier Cesare Balbo had suggested that Austria should voluntarily relinquish her Italian provinces and seek compensation in south-eastern Europe. A plan was now set on foot by which under a peaceful exchange Austria should acquire Moldavia and Wallachia in place of Venice.

But a change in sovereignty over the Danubian Principalities involved many conflicting interests and the scheme failed to mature. The men who succeeded Cavour were far inferior to him in genius, but understood how to turn the rivalries of more powerful States to Italy's advantage. As a French alliance had been the means of uniting Lombardy to the dominions of the House of Savoy, so a timely alliance with Prussia secured

Venetia in 1866 after diplomacy had failed to bring about its acquisition by peaceful means. Intervention in the War between Prussia and Austria had united Venice to Italy, but neutrality was the means of acquiring Rome. Italian intervention as France's ally in 1870 was not, however, outside the range of possibility. After the first disasters in August the Emperor's cousin, Prince Napoleon, who had married Victor Emmanuel's elder daughter, visited Florence to sound his father-in-law with regard to the possibility of Italian aid for France. The King's impetuous nature would have prompted him to rush to the assistance of his old ally. But the Lanza-Sella ministry vetoed intervention and did so wisely. Italy could not at that late hour have averted the débâcle of Sedan and after it would have been compelled to make an undignified withdrawal from the war. Though the political separation of Rome from the new kingdom could not be indefinitely prevented the circumstances under which union took place were such as to create a feeling of bitter antagonism between Catholic opinion throughout the world and the new State.

The foreign policy of United Italy now entered its second phase, that of being directed towards the preservation of what had been achieved. The danger of disruption came from one source only, that of exploitation by some power hostile to Italy of the dissidence between the Vatican and the Quirinal. For many years there existed in Southern Italy a party favourable to the idea of a Bourbon restoration, but it never became a grave menace to the unity of the country, and Austria sought to recoup herself in the Balkan Peninsula for her loss of the Lombardo-Venetian provinces.

But Catholic feeling demanded the restoration of Peter's city to the secular rule of Peter's successor, with a sublime disregard for its impracticability. As early as the autumn of 1870 Archbishop Ledochowski of Gnesen and Posen, curiously unconscious of the impending *Kulturkampf*, visited Bismarck at Versailles in the hope of securing Prussian intervention on behalf of the Pope. Such action did not suit the Iron Chancellor's plans and France was in no position to act had she desired to do so.



For the first ten years after the occupation of Rome Italy kept free from European entanglements. She was represented at the Congress of Berlin, but her delegate, Count Corti, came back with clean but empty hands. In 1881 two events broke down Italian isolation. In April of that year France, profiting by a disturbance among the Khroumirs, a tribe on the Algerian border, occupied the Regency of Tunis and by the Treaty of the Bardo forced upon the Bey acceptance of a French protectorate. Both on geographical grounds and because of the number of Italian colonists it contained the Regency had been regarded as a sphere of Italian influence and ultimately of Italian expansion. The emotion caused throughout the country by Jules Ferry's forward policy was profound and Garibaldi's death was hastened by the exertion of a journey to Palermo to address a meeting of protest against France's action.

For the second event the Italian Government was itself to blame. Insufficient precautions were taken to prevent an outbreak of hooliganism on the occasion of the transference of the remains of Pius IX from the Vatican Basilica to San Lorenzo Fuori-le-Muore. An attempt was made to throw the Pope's body into the Tiber. Bismarck knew well how to make use of an incident of this sort. The *Kulturkampf* was being slowly wound up, and the moderation of Leo XIII made it possible for the Chancellor to appear as a champion of the Papacy. His foreign policy was not at the moment an expansionist one. Its aim was to consolidate the gains achieved by the wars of 1864, 1866 and 1870 and its means of achieving that end was to protect Germany against coalitions. In 1872, by means of the "Three Emperors' League", Bismarck sought to avert a war of revenge on the part of France. But when conflicting Balkan interests led Russia and Austria apart he sought an Italian alliance to replace the Russian one. The task of bringing together Berlin and Rome was in some ways as difficult in 1881 as in 1938. Masonry was then enjoying its heyday in Rome and the Italian monarchy was united by close ideological ties to the French Republic. Germany, on the other hand, was anxious to improve her relations

with the Vatican, and an Austrian alliance was naturally unpopular in Italy.

When Prussia and Italy had been allies in 1866 Austria had been the common enemy. To draw Rome into alliance with Vienna taxed Bismarck's capacity to the uttermost. But fortune favoured him and he knew how to play the cards which she put into his hand. France's seizure of Tunis made Italy more friendly to the idea of a German alliance, while the Chancellor cleverly exploited the indignation caused by the attempt to throw Pius IX's body into the Tiber. It was intimated to Italy that if she showed hesitation in allying herself with Germany and Austria these Powers might threaten intervention in support of the Pope's protests against the Law of Guarantees. Such a humiliation Italy could not brook. She attached herself to the Austro-German combination, thus converting it into a Triple Alliance. The connexion with Austria was hard to stomach, but that with Berlin at least provided a guarantee against an attack by France. In Austria there was likewise some repugnance to the idea of an alliance with the Pope's "gaoler" as the King of Italy was dubbed in clerical circles. But Kalnoky, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, afterwards declared that he had agreed to no conditions which could give the Roman Curia ground for complaint. It was for many years widely believed that the three contracting Powers had mutually guaranteed each other's territorial integrity and that Austria-Hungary had thus set her seal on the Italian occupation of Rome. In reality, however, when the official text of the Treaty was published years later, it transpired that no such guarantee had been given. Italy was in this way spared the humiliation of having to recognize Austrian sovereignty over Trieste and the Trentino in return for Austrian recognition of Italian sovereignty over Rome.

A naval understanding with England guaranteed Italy against a French attack by sea as the alliance with Germany guaranteed her against an attack by land. We may well ask ourselves, whether a France which was rapidly becoming laicized would seriously have con-

templated military intervention against Italy on behalf of Leo XIII. Jules Ferry, in 1892, declared it to be incomprehensible how Italians, who were not fools, could believe that the France, which had instituted the lay school, could nourish the secret design of restoring the Temporal Power of the Pope. Yet such an idea had become an obsession with Crispi and many others; since for France, while pursuing an anti-clerical policy at home, to adopt a clericalist foreign policy, though difficult, would not have been beyond the bounds of possibility. If men like Crispi were prone to credulity, nevertheless so shrewd an observer as Prince Hohenlohe believed that France and Russia might use the Roman Question as a pretext for a war of aggression against the Triple Alliance. The advantages of such a course were obvious, since Austria could be but with difficulty induced to support Italy in such a war and the attitude of the German Catholics would be lukewarm.

The rivalries among the Great Powers unfortunately had the effect of drawing the Vatican into the vortex of international politics. Under the influence of Rampolla, who succeeded Cardinal Jacobini as Secretary of State in 1887, Leo XIII sought a rapprochement with Russia and France and the diplomatic duel between Rampolla and Crispi had perhaps a touch of acerbity added to it by the fact that both antagonists were Sicilians. A triplicist policy, however, was favoured by a section of the Curia whose leader was Cardinal Galimberti. The alliance with Berlin and Vienna, while it secured Italy's territorial integrity, nevertheless involved heavy expenditure on armaments at a time when money was more urgently needed for internal development, and in the closing years of the century social unrest at home was a matter for graver preoccupation than foreign policy.

After the fall of Crispi in 1896 the Triple Alliance never recovered its former vitality, though it was to undergo four more quinquennial renewals. The wave of social unrest which was passing over Europe did not leave Italy untouched, and for a moment, when after the sanguinary disorders at Milan in May 1898 King Humbert entrusted the formation of a government to

General Pelloux, it looked as though the country were threatened with the alternatives of revolution and dictatorship. When the mere possibility of Franco-Russian intervention on behalf of the Pope had vanished irredentism at the expense of Austria tended to become the goal of Italian nationalist hopes. The discomfiture of clericalism in France improved Franco-Italian relations and in 1904 President Loubet visited Rome, disregarding the protests of Pius X and Cardinal Merry del Val, the only occasion on which a head of the French state has visited United Italy. The streets of the Holy City rang with cries of *Evviva la Francia anticlericale*.

For a short time it looked as though the Great Powers were going to be divided into two "ideological" camps, as they would nowadays be called. Britain, France, and Italy represented the type of State which rightly or wrongly was labelled democratic. Germany, Russia, and Austria were States of what is called the authoritarian type. But though anticlericalism was highly popular among working-men and university students, official Italy, alarmed at the growth of politically subversive ideas, gradually began to make cautious advances towards the Catholics; advances which were discreetly reciprocated. The loss of France's prestige as a Catholic Power in the Near East in consequence of the lay laws was also a circumstance out of which the Consulta was able to make a little profit. These years marked the opening of the third or expansionist phase in the history of Italian foreign policy. In the division of Africa, Italy had acquired only a modest share of the spoils. After the disaster at Adowa a forward policy in Abyssinia was abandoned. The Italians evacuated their advanced post at Kassala and were content with a restricted frontier for their colony of Eritrea. But in 1911 a decision had to be taken nearer home. The Young Turk movement had failed to regenerate the Ottoman Empire and arrest the forces of decay. The future of the long strip of African coast stretching from the Tunisian border to the Gulf of Sollum became a source of anxiety to the Consulta. It was the last surviving remnant of the Sultan's African dominions and the Powers were casting hungry

eyes upon it. There were rumours of plans for its partition between France and England and of a German plan for the establishment of a naval base at Tobruk. Tripoli and Cyrenaica were of course Italy's natural share of the prey, if the Ottoman Empire should disrupt and to avoid being cheated as she had been cheated over Tunis, she forestalled events by seizing the Sultan's North African provinces in the autumn of 1911. The war, which might have been a quick one, was prolonged for a year by the refusal of Austria, backed by Germany, to allow Italy to conduct military operations against Turkey in Europe after Italian cruisers had sunk a Turkish gunboat off Preveza.

Coldness on the part of Italy's allies might even have gone further, and the Austrian General Staff seems to have contemplated a preventive war against her, while she had the campaign in Africa on her hands. As the Tripoli War petered out the young Balkan States fell like vultures on the decaying body of European Turkey, and the Balkan wars restored something of its pristine vigour to the Triple Alliance. Italy supported Germany and Austria in their insistence that a separate independent Albanian State should be created, while the Triple Entente would not have opposed the partition of the country between Serbia, Greece, and Montenegro. For months Europe trembled on the brink of a general war, while the frontiers of the new state were being drawn, and the lives of millions of men were staked on the trivial issues of whether Ipek and Jakova were to be one side of the frontier or the other. In the summer of 1913, however, Italy was instrumental in preventing an Austrian attack on Serbia and a general cataclysm was delayed for another year. When it came Italy acted consistently in declaring herself neutral. As Germany and Austria had gone to war without consulting her, she was not bound to take up arms. The attitude of the Central Empires towards their southern ally was always somewhat disdainful and they were convinced of their ability to achieve victory without her aid.

On the other hand, it must be remembered that Franco-Italian relations had lost the cordiality which

they possessed at the time of Loubet's visit. Serious friction had been aroused between the two countries by the stopping during the war of the French mailboats *Carthage* and *Manouba*, suspected of bringing supplies to the Turkish forces in Tripoli. A small group of Italian nationalists did, however, advocate intervention on the Austro-German side at the outbreak of hostilities. There can be no doubt in the mind of an unbiassed student of history that Italian intervention at this juncture would have decided the issue of the war in Germany's favour. Had it been necessary for France to maintain two or three Army Corps in the south-eastern departments her main armies would have been so weakened as to have made the fall of Paris inevitable, while the Italian fleet acting in conjunction with the Austro-Hungarian navy and the two German cruisers then in the Mediterranean could have gravely interfered with the transport of troops from North Africa to France. Italy's reward for her assistance in the event of an Austro-German victory would have been Nice, Corsica, Tunis, and Malta. Had Austria at the outbreak of war voluntarily ceded the Trentino to Italy and granted Trieste a liberal measure of autonomy Italian support could have been purchased. Such concessions would even have purchased Italian neutrality six months after the outbreak of war, had the men responsible for Austro-Hungarian policy been wise enough to make them. But the eyeless policy of the Ballplatz refused all concessions till they were too late to be of any use, since Italy had committed herself to the Allies. An attitude of neutrality maintained by Italy throughout the war would have made it impossible for the Allies to have achieved a decisive victory; since if Austria had been able to leave her south-western frontier unguarded, sufficient troops would have been released for employment against Russia for a decision in the East to have been achieved before America had intervened. Italian neutrality would thus have produced a stalemate and so it can be said that Italy's policy proved a decisive factor in the war. Italian intervention on the Allied side is sometimes attributed to the skill of British propaganda in Italy. The effect



of this, however, has been exaggerated. Not even the appeals of the French masons to their brethren beyond the Alps could have had a decisive effect on Italian policy. For the political influence of masonry, though still powerful, had by 1915 ceased to be all-powerful in Italy. The war in North Africa had been embarked upon in the teeth of masonic opposition grounded on the fact that the leaders of the Young Turks were Freemasons. The determining factor was the conviction of the new nationalist party that now or never the question of Italy's north-eastern frontier must be settled, though it must of course be admitted that the nationalist point of view gained considerable support from the fact that a war against Catholic Austria was welcome to the Freemasons on ideological grounds. The bulk of the nation would have preferred neutrality, and in desiring it the Catholics and Socialists reflected the popular feeling.

Like the Risorgimento and the Fascist Revolution Italian participation in the Great War was the work of a determined minority. But the men at the head of affairs exhausted all possibilities in their efforts to come to an agreement with Austria which would have peacefully solved the irredentist problem. They were wholly uninfluenced by propagandist appeals to enter the war in the interests of "democracy" and "civilization". But Austrian obstinacy defeated all efforts to reach a settlement. Both in Italy and in France conflicting war aims existed between the nationalists and the Masons. In France the former considered Prussia the chief enemy and desired the break up of the Prussianized German Empire; while they were often anxious to keep the Austro-Hungarian Empire in being as a counter-poise to Prussia. The Masons and those who shared the masonic outlook worked primarily for the destruction of the Dual Monarchy, which they regarded as the chief political support of the Papacy in Europe, while they often favoured a moderate peace with Germany. The Italian Masons saw eye to eye with the French ones as regards the Austrian question; but the Italian nationalists, while somewhat exorbitant in their terri-

torial demands, did not object to, and perhaps even desired, the maintenance in being of a reduced Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. When peace came, Mr. Wilson in the name of self-determination vetoed the acquisition of some of the territory promised to Italy by the Pact of London and she was denied a share in the distribution of the mandates. In spite of these disappointments Italy, at the conclusion of peace, occupied an international position such as she had never known before. The dissolution of the Hapsburg monarchy, the retirement of Russia from European affairs and the temporary eclipse of Germany as a great Power left her in the position of being the third State in Europe in political magnitude. Internal dissensions, however, prevented the full advantages of this from being reaped. Economic distress resultant upon the war and disappointment with the achievements wrought by the peace treaties stirred up political currents which, while hostile to each other, were united in their opposition to the Liberal and Parliamentary Monarchy.

Midway between the Fascist and Socialist groups stood the *partito popolare* which, while containing certain nationalist elements, was largely made up of those Catholics who had opposed Italy's entrance into the war. The "Popular Party" was opposed to an adventurous foreign policy. The Liberal ministries which held an insecure tenure of power between 1918 and 1922 obtained the Brenner frontier by the Treaty of St. Germain, but were forced to relinquish Italy's claims to northern Dalmatia except for Zara and a few islands. The protectorate over Albania was voluntarily given up by Giolitti.

In its foreign policy two tendencies have been observable in the Fascist outlook. One has looked at all external problems from the angle of a narrow Italian nationalism; the other has exhibited a more international outlook, but that of an internationalism remote from the League of Nations and having its roots in the Imperial Rome. Fascism came to power with an ambitious programme of irredentist aspirations: Nice and Corsica from France, Ticino and part of the Grisons

from Switzerland, the Free City of Fiume, and Malta from England. During its earlier years of power a crude nationalism pervaded its approach to international affairs. The stupid bombardment of Corfu was a bad beginning and in no ways foreshadowed the larger outlook on European problems which Mussolini was later to exhibit. Two small diplomatic successes were achieved in the early days of his tenure of office. The cession of Jubaland though regarded, and rightly regarded, as an insufficient fulfilment of the promises made to Italy under the Pact of London, was a welcome sequel to King George's visit to Rome, and Fiume was united to Italy as the result of bilateral negotiations with Yugoslavia under which the suburb of Porto Barros was acquired by the latter.

Under the Liberal ministries which preceded the March on Rome, Italy had tended to become more loosely attached to France and England and to be far less estranged from Germany than they were. A liberal policy was adopted towards the German-speaking inhabitants of the Alto-Adige, and at one time their peaceful retrocession to Austria seemed not altogether out of the reach of practical politics. The aggressive nationalism of the first days of the Fascist régime reversed all this and a policy of repression towards expressions of German nationalism in northern Italy was inaugurated. The maintenance of the Brenner frontier became the cardinal point of Fascist foreign policy. So long as her neighbour was the weak Austrian Republic this frontier was not, of course, in danger. In the event of a fusion of the two German republics Italy might be confronted with a German irredentist movement which it would have been difficult to resist. Yet his veto on the *Anschluss* was the cardinal error of Mussolini's foreign policy. By co-operating with France in preventing the application to Germany of the vaunted principles of self-determination he helped to prepare the way for the National-Socialist revolution. With the exception of the Legitimists all parties in Austria desired union with the German Republic and had self-determination been allowed to Austria, the Nationalist uprising in Germany,

when it came, would have taken in all probability a comparatively mild form, since the Austrian-Germans would have exercised a moderating influence upon political tendencies within the Reich. In spite of their common policy in vetoing self-determination for Austria relations between France and Italy were far from cordial. Indeed, the suppression of Freemasonry in Italy was not far removed from a declaration of war against France, so close had become the identification of masonry with the French State under the Third Republic. The tradition by which our press does not allude to the rôle played by masonry both in international politics and in the internal affairs of many European States is an understandable one. But it has the disadvantage of frequently befogging the mind of the average British newspaper reader. Even English Catholic opinion is largely, though of course, quite unconsciously, formed by masonic influences. Italy therefore in the early days of the Fascist régime occupied a somewhat isolated position in Europe. France harboured many exiles from the country and was the centre of anti-Fascist conspiracies; while the Italian veto on the *Anschluss* prevented any real cordiality from developing between Italy and Germany. Yugoslavia was estranged by fears of Italian designs on Dalmatia, promised her by France and Britain to induce her to enter the war. Britain was rendered suspicious by the Italian nationalist claim to Malta. The *pronunciamento* carried out by the Spanish army leaders in 1923, though it was a movement reminiscent of the nineteenth century rather than of the post-war epoch, gave to one country in Europe a government in full sympathy with Fascist Italy. The first Italo-Spanish rapprochement was not a cause of uneasiness in Paris and London like the second one, since Germany was in 1923 of no account in European affairs. Austria and Hungary also occupied a certain position of dependence upon Italy, as did the Little Entente upon France, but their military weakness gave them but slight value as potential allies.

The fall of the Directory and the proclamation of the second Spanish Republic brought Spain out of the

orbit of Italy into that of France. But as a compensating factor there was a slight improvement in Franco-Italian relations. In 1931 both countries were united in their resolve to prevent, if necessary by force, the Austrian people from exercising that self-determination for which the Allies had hypocritically pretended they were fighting the war. The project of an Austro-German customs union was absolutely vetoed both by Rome and Paris. In the following year the parties of the Left were again returned to power in France. Anticlericalism was no longer a prominent feature of their programme, but the fact that Mussolini had now reached an agreement with the Vatican made his régime increasingly distasteful to Freemasons throughout the world. The advent of National Socialism to power had the effect of an earthquake on the European system. It led capitalists in England and France to cultivate friendship with the Communists of Moscow, whom they had recently denounced as filthy butchers. It made the French parties of the Left more anti-German than those of the Right and created the strange spectacle of Freemasons and Jews seeking the co-operation of the Vatican, while it caused many Austrians to reconsider the desirability of union with the Reich. Upon Italy it placed a difficult choice. The National Socialist movement had strong ideological affinities with Fascism and was in part inspired by it. The two régimes had many enemies in common. But on the other hand it was the cardinal point of Nazi foreign policy to achieve the *Anschluss* which it was the cardinal point of Fascist foreign policy to prevent. The Duce at first sought to achieve the impossible, to cultivate friendly relations with the new Germany, while forbidding her to realize her most cherished design, though the situation had taken on a new aspect because Austrian opinion was much less strongly in favour of the *Anschluss* after the Revolution in Germany. It was now possible for the Duce to pose as the defender of Austrian independence. This rôle might have been maintained for some years, had he not decided on imitating England and France in acquiring for Italy an enlarged colonial empire. The territory

marked on the maps as "Abyssinia" was a much larger one than the government of the Negus could provide with an efficient administration and Italy would have been satisfied with a solution which would have left the central Amharic region under the sovereignty of the Emperor. Statesmanship and commonsense indicated a solution on these lines. But the temptation to use the League as a means for getting rid of a government they disliked was too strong for certain elements in England and on the Continent. On the eve of the Abyssinian War a mobilization on the Brenner frontier was a warning to Germany that Italy's resolve not to have that Power as a neighbour remained unshaken. Perhaps she would not have been sorry to see an armed conflict between the Powers break out over the remilitarization of the Rhineland, since this would have spelt the end of Sanctions. Defiance of the League was a tremendous risk, but it was successful because by an extraordinary piece of good fortune, the one French Minister who showed himself really friendly to Fascist Italy, Laval, was in office at the critical moment of the application of Sanctions and he was enabled to make provision that they should be "benevolently" enforced. Within two months of the end of the war in Africa came the civil war in Spain, a sort of dress rehearsal for the war of 1939, as had been the Balkan wars for that of 1914. Russia and France intervened on one side, Germany and Italy on the other, and though Britain's attitude was nominally impartial, her relations with France were too close to give that impartiality the semblance of reality. The fact that Germany took no part in Sanctions did something to mitigate the bad relations which had existed between that Power and Italy, since the attempted Nazi coup in Vienna in 1934. But co-operation in Spain brought the governments of Berlin and Rome appreciably nearer together, though the problem of Austria still impeded full co-operation. That the union of Germany and Austria was ultimately inevitable was apparent to all not blinded by prejudice. Three times during the nineteenth century the Powers had failed in their efforts to keep apart by artificial



frontiers States drawn together by the ties of a common speech. National sentiment proved too strong for the arrangements by which the Treaty of Vienna had divided up Italy. After the Crimean War the attempt made by the statesmen who concluded the Treaty of Paris to prevent the fusion of the two Roumanian principalities proved equally unavailing. The Congress of Berlin separated the Bulgarians living north of the Balkans from those living south of it. Seven years later a bloodless revolution in Philippopolis united the Bulgarians of Eastern Rumelia to those of the Principality. But the statesmen who fashioned the treaties of Versailles and Saint-Germain either knew no history or were incapable of applying its lessons. The only question was whether, when the *Anschluss* took place, it would involve Europe in a general war. The Führer had cleverly timed the reoccupation of the Rhineland and he showed equal astuteness in selecting the moment for his annexation of Austria.

Public opinion in England, with its incurable incapacity for logical consistency, angrily denounced Hitler's action, though it had deliriously applauded Cavour when he had acted in a similar way. The "clericalism" of the Austrian Government naturally made the French parties of the Left lukewarm in its defence. It was the action of Italy which proved decisive. The Duce was confronted with the most difficult choice in the sphere of foreign politics that he had ever been called upon to face. It was plainly impossible for him to fight Russia and France in Spain as Germany's ally and at the same time join Britain and France in opposing the advance of the German frontier to the Brenner. Mussolini had either to abandon General Franco or Austria. Deciding that the cause of the Spanish Nationalists was a living, and that of Austria, torn by the rivalries of Nazis, Legitimists, Socialists, and supporters of a Christian Corporative State, a dying cause, he chose the latter course, reversed the policy which he had defended for fifteen years under threat of appeal to arms and effected his reversal of policy with dignity by entertaining the head of the German State in Rome. The

dissolution of the artificial Czechoslovak State was cordially welcomed in Fascist circles, primarily of course because of the masonic affinities of its government and because it formed a link between Paris and Moscow, but it was also realized that its peculiar shape and the heterogeneous composition of its racial elements made its eventual disappearance from the map of Europe inevitable. But in addition to this it was the ex-President of the Czechoslovak Republic who had led the campaign of sanctions by the fifty nations. The Munich Agreement was a grave setback for masonry and were it not the fact that its aims and those of the British Conservative party now harmonized, it might have been a fatal one. The British Conservative tends to see all European and even world problems under one aspect, the safety of Imperial communications. At first he had been somewhat sympathetic to the Fascist movement since it broke up strikes and might therefore be regarded as an ally of capitalism. But when it became apparent that Fascism challenged the doctrine of the divine right of the Anglo-Saxon peoples to control the destinies of our planet, and in particular of the Mediterranean, the British Conservative grew a little nervous. The form of Freemasonry which he knew best was the old respectable English type. But he now began to exchange friendly glances with masonry of another sort. Ever since its inception international masonry had shown an especial solicitude for the welfare of the League of Nations, and English Conservatives came to feel that that institution might be made to subserve imperial interests. The Munich Agreement and the recognition of General Franco enraged masonic opinion against Mr. Chamberlain. Masonry recovered its waning influence after the German occupation of Prague. The news of this event was at first received calmly in England, but within forty-eight hours hidden forces began to raise English opinion on the subject to fever heat. In Italy, on the other hand, the German thesis that the occupation of Prague anticipated a coup on the part of ex-President Benesh's supporters to regain power and provoke a European War seems to have been accepted. The

Western Powers replied to the occupation of Prague by seeking an alliance with Russia and by guaranteeing unconditionally the frontiers of Poland. On 27 May Mussolini warned the British Government of the danger of giving a blank cheque to Poland, but his warning fell upon deaf ears.

In view of the extent to which the unfortunate policy of Mr. Chamberlain and Lord Halifax would expose the Balkans to Soviet influence Italy invaded Albania on April 7. Her primary object in making herself a Balkan power was no doubt to strengthen the anti-Soviet forces in the Balkan Peninsula, as she had helped to victory the anti-Soviet forces in the Iberian one. The circumstances under which Britain occupied Egypt and France Tunis indicate that neither of these Powers would, placed in a like position, have hesitated to act as Italy did; but there was indignation in England that the invasion began on Good Friday. Perhaps the fact that the House of Commons was not sitting had something to do with this, but Englishmen would do well to reflect on a parallel incident in the history of their own country. When Lord Kitchener was planning the attack on the Dervish forces on the Atbara he took the view that it should not be made on a Friday. When reminded that the day in question was Good Friday, he changed his mind, saying that the battle was an act of liberation and that therefore Good Friday was a most fitting day for the attack. The exorcizing of the menace to which the Balkan Peninsula was being exposed by the dangerous policy pursued by France and Britain in seeking an alliance with Russia was no less felicitous than the liberation of the Sudan from the oppression of the Khalifa.

Britain and France accepted with good grace the annexation of Albania and their Press consoled itself with the fact that it bottled up the mouth of the Adriatic not only against the British fleet, but also against a German one, should Germany ever advance to its shores.

The Russo-German Pact raised again a diplomatic problem which Bismarck solved successfully fifty years

ago. Germany is now confronted with the difficulty of being at the same time the ally of Moscow and of Rome, as was the Iron Chancellor of maintaining a simultaneous alliance with St. Petersburg and with Vienna. This difficulty he solved by the two instruments of the Triple Alliance and his "Re-insurance Treaty" with Russia. Now that Italy exercises sovereignty over a part of the Balkan Peninsula, she has become in that region the heir of the old Austria. Like Austria she will strive to minimize Russian influence in that part of Europe. But Italy's policy towards the Soviets has always been realistic. She has never, like England and France, sought to interfere in Russia's internal affairs. Provided that Russia will not seek to bring the nations of South-Eastern Europe within her sphere of influence, and will devote her energies to developing the resources of her own enormous territory, Italy will not quarrel with her. Strange as it may sound, the difficulties in the way of an accord between France and Italy are in some ways greater than those of an accord between Italy and Russia. For while Fascism and the Soviet system can agree each to dwell within its own appointed sphere of influence, masonry is bound by the law of its being to seek to regain its lost power in Italy. Looking backward over the course of Italian history since the days of Cavour, we cannot but be struck by those intuitions of genius which have enabled the men in power to derive increased prestige for their country from each successive crisis. In this respect there has been observable a continuity of policy, whether the direction of that policy has lain in Liberal or in Fascist hands. For Freemasonry, while it has played havoc in Italy's domestic politics, has never been allowed to have the deciding voice in her foreign policy. By his participation in the Crimean War Cavour laid the foundations of Italian unity. The Austro-Prussian War of 1866 and the Franco-German War of 1870 were used by Italy to complete that unity.

The Great War brought her a further extension of her influence and today she conceives herself as confronted by a mightier mission, that of restoring order

and cohesion to the world as she has done before. Out of the chaos of rival states into which the world fell on the death of Alexander the Great, Rome ultimately brought order. Out of the chaos reigning today it may well be in the Providence of God that it will be Italy's mission, through her incomparable sense of realism, to lead the world back once again to the paths of order.

HUMPHREY J. T. JOHNSON.

## THE FATE OF THE ENGLISH MONASTIC LIBRARIES

OUR modern age prides itself on the respect which it shows for the inheritance of earlier generations. In England alone what fortunes have been spent on the upkeep of her ancient cathedrals and parish churches ! It has been the same abroad, as all visitors to France, Germany, or Italy can testify. And the inheritance of written records from the Middle Ages has been cared for with the same loving skill. Those who have been privileged to work in the manuscript room of any of the great libraries of modern Europe will know the precautions that surround the use of these treasured witnesses to the learning of a past age. Yet there is another side to the picture. No observer has yet been able to reckon the full cost to scholarship of the disastrous civil war in Spain ; and we are beginning to forget Spain in our more recent troubles. I have just been reading the report of the Franciscan commission that has set about the formidable task of preparing a sound critical text of Duns Scotus. Manuscript texts of his Lectures on the Sentences are to be found all over Europe, and they must all be examined—for the critical problem of editing such *reportata* from the lecture-halls of Oxford and Paris is unusually complicated. One collaborator in this great joint enterprise spent the summer of 1939 in a tour through the libraries of Germany, where he was permitted to photograph more than 5000 folios of text. His labour was not in vain, as events have already proved. One of the best texts was in Danzig. Others were at Cracow and Warsaw. Today ? And tomorrow ? Is our generation likely to be remembered for a wholesale destruction of Europe's cultural inheritance ?

England's library treasures have been placed in safety for the duration of the war. Let us hope that they will pass unscathed through the dangers that lie ahead. Most of them have survived many perils in the past ; and it is perhaps a suitable moment to attempt some rough estimate of what has been lost and saved in the past five hundred years.



A student who has worked his way through the scores of modern catalogues, in which scholars from so many nations have recorded the surviving literature of the Middle Ages, may be pardoned for wondering at times whether what has been lost can be comparable with what has survived. In England alone, the national collections in the British Museum, the Bodleian and Cambridge University Libraries; the many hundreds of scholastic texts that still lie, for the most part unread, in the college libraries of the two Universities; the smaller, but sometimes more precious collections in the cathedral cities: when the sum of all these treasures is added together, it seems incredible that much can have been lost that was worth keeping. Yet there is a very simple way of checking this calculation. Several mediaeval catalogues of monastic and other libraries have survived, most of them from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Not all of them have been studied with sufficient care; but a group of scholars, the most prominent among them being the late Dr. M. R. James, have worked their way patiently through most of them, and have done their best to identify surviving items in our modern collections. The results are astonishingly meagre. No doubt a large number of these manuscripts have lost the press-marks and other indications of ownership that might help to a more accurate identification. But it seems certain that by far the larger number of the volumes recorded in these surviving mediaeval catalogues perished in the disastrous years of Tudor despotism.

A few figures may be of interest. Early in the fifteenth century a Benedictine monk of Bury St. Edmunds, by name John Boston, set himself to make a full analytical catalogue of all the books preserved in the monastic libraries of his day. Incidentally, the mere fact that such a catalogue should have been attempted in the fifteenth century alters our whole understanding of Tudor antiquarianism. For Leland and Bale are usually cited as the fathers of English antiquarian scholarship. Both men worked hastily, with the sense of impending ruin to urge them on. Leland made his survey immediately before the official dissolution of the monasteries. Bale,

who had been a Carmelite friar and knew many of the great conventual libraries from within, made his notes at a time when the books which he knew so well were being scattered to the four winds of Heaven. John Boston's catalogue was a very much more systematic and laborious affair. It included the works of some 700 authors, classified by their subject-matter in certain large groups; and it was planned as a record of the contents of some 200 existing libraries. The number may seem surprisingly large—yet the list was confined, almost exclusively, to monastic libraries. It omits most of the libraries of the mendicant friars and the important collections at Oxford and Cambridge. Nor was John Boston the first to attempt such an index. Two earlier Franciscan catalogues have come down to us from the fourteenth century: the *Tabule septem custodiarum super Bibliam*, and the *Registrum Anglie de libris doctorum et auctorum veterum*. Both these lists maintain a local division of England into the seven (or eight) custodies of the English Franciscan province. The *Tabule* lists the works of some 80 authors, with a full record of the number of extant copies in each library. The *Registrum* covers 167 libraries of the fourteenth century, and lists the works of 70 authors. Boston's catalogue includes a short biographical notice of each author; the libraries are cited by a reference number, the key being found in a list of 195 monasteries and cathedrals in which Boston had made his notes. It will be seen that fifteenth-century England was not lacking in books, nor in the tradition of skilled librarians.

Not all these libraries, of course, were of equal size and value. Trinity College, Dublin, possesses today an important catalogue of one of the greatest monastic collections in England: the Benedictine library of St. Augustine's, Canterbury. The catalogue was compiled in the last years of the fifteenth century, barely a generation before the suppression. Some 1830 volumes are listed, and most of them, according to the prevalent mediaeval custom, contained more than one text. The catalogue, which has been studied in detail by Dr. James, is a model of its kind: with cross-references

throughout, and a careful record of the author, title, donor and press-mark of each volume. More valuable still is the record of the opening words of the second folio in each volume. This excellent mediaeval custom has often made an identification certain where there might otherwise have been room for doubt.

If monastic life may be judged by the care of books in a fine library, St. Augustine's comes well out of the test. And there are other indications that the monks of the fifteenth century, who were as a whole more open to the new Italian humanism than their contemporary brethren in the mendicant orders, took proper care of their inheritance. A new library seems to have been built at Christ Church, Canterbury, towards the middle of the century. Abbot John Whethamstede built a fine new library at St. Albans during his second abbacy (1452-3); Prior Wessington built a new library at Durham during his tenure of office (1416-41); and at Bury St. Edmunds Abbot Curteys (1429-45) rebuilt the library. These are no more than a few indications, to which scholars with more detailed knowledge can easily add.

Yet there is another side to the picture, and it would be rash to conclude that all English monasteries of pre-Reformation England were as careful of their books as some of the principal and more wealthy communities. Those who have handled mediaeval texts know how frequently an individual monk or friar wrote his name, apparently as a private owner, on books that must have belonged originally to the common library. It is an easy step from such loose administration to loss of valuable property. Perhaps the best-known example of a book that went astray long before the suppression under Henry VIII is the text of St. Augustine's *De Civitate Dei* which Grosseteste had owned in the thirteenth century, and which he had annotated freely in his own hand. Here was a fine relic of the friendship between the Oxford Friars Minor and Oxford's first Chancellor—for Grosseteste bequeathed his books to Adam Marsh and his community of Greyfriars. Two hundred years later the friars seem to have lost interest

in these manuscripts, for Thomas Gascoigne was able to acquire the *De Civitate Dei* and other texts from Grosseteste's library in 1433. They were a free gift from the friars to a friend whose patronage was worth having; but the gift argues neglect of the convent library.

Leland's account of his visit to the Oxford Greyfriars on the eve of the suppression has often been quoted. It is not certain that his evidence is convincing, for the friars looked on this visit as a prelude to confiscation, and they probably took care to hide as much as could be hidden. None the less, we get a general impression of neglect, which was perhaps more characteristic of the friars than of the monks at this late period: "At the Franciscans house there are cobwebs in the library, and moths and bookworms. More than this, whatever others may boast, nothing if you have regard to learned books. For I, in spite of the opposition of all the friars, carefully examined all the bookcases of the library."

I have come across another curious instance of carelessness in the loss of a volume that modern librarians would surely cherish. The priory of the Austin Canons at Dorchester, near Oxford, was an important house in the fourteenth century. Towards the middle of that century some scribe copied an elaborate Latin Concordance of the Bible, into which he worked (as an illumination of twenty initial letters of the alphabet) portraits with names of twenty members of the community. The Dorchester canons must have fallen on evil days in the following century, for they let the volume go, perhaps at a good price, perhaps through carelessness. It found its way to Ireland, where it was acquired by a Franciscan community, probably of Dublin or Drogheda. Thence it passed to a small community of the friars at Slane on the Boyne, where it was in the reign of Henry VIII. There is a note on its first leaf, dating from this period, in which the friars are warned that it is not to be returned to the unnamed convent whence it had come to Slane, until its owners have returned a text of St. Thomas that belonged to the smaller community. The volume is now in the library of Trinity College, Dublin.

Dr. James has noted an instance in which a volume that would now be classified as rare and precious was lent to a house of studies at Oxford for the use of students, and was thus lost to the monastery. The text was an out-of-the-way copy of the Homilies of Ancarius the Levite—just the sort of text that was sure to attract Dr. James, who had a passion for the unusual. It is marked in the catalogue of St. Augustine's as having been lent with others to the Benedictine house of studies at Oxford, on the present site of Worcester College. There it disappeared, most probably at the time of the royal visitation under Edward VI.

Here is a book which survived the first suppression under Henry VIII, but fell a victim to the amazingly crude ignorance of Edward's commissioners. It is difficult to convince a modern student that any royal commission could have been quite as grossly incompetent and destructive as this commission is proved to have been from admitted facts. To quote Dr. James, who was never weary of driving this point home: at Cambridge there are still extant mediaeval catalogues of the old libraries of Corpus Christi, Trinity Hall, King's, Queen's, St. Catherine's, and the University Library. Of 300 books formerly in the University Library, only 19 exist today. Of 176 in King's, only one exists today. In Clare College a whole library has disappeared. Peterhouse alone has kept its mediaeval library. At Oxford things were somewhat better, thanks to a more conservative tradition. But there were losses. There were some 600 volumes in the old Duke Humphrey's collection, dating from the fifteenth century. Only three of these now remain in the Bodleian; another dozen or so are elsewhere. And the rest? They seem to have gone under in the wholesale destruction of "useless" manuscripts ordered by Edward VI's royal commissioners. One very striking instance of their crude ignorance has recently come to light. Professor Powicke has made an exceedingly fine study of the old mediaeval volumes that are still the glory of Merton Library. The sections of Biblical manuscripts, patristic and scholastic theology, literature and history are

remarkably complete. But hardly any mathematical or physical texts have survived. Yet Merton was a famous centre of the Oxford school of mathematics in the Middle Ages. Men like Thomas Bradwardine and his successors must have collected a fine library of these texts. They have vanished today, and (though Professor Powicke's gentle soul is reluctant to believe the evidence) they must have perished in the whirlwind campaign of destruction that fell on the two English Universities under Edward VI.

What became of the libraries in the great monastic centres? As is natural, we know most of a few famous houses. At Canterbury Christ Church was reorganized as a cathedral of the new foundation, whilst St. Augustine's was swept away. To quote Dr. James again: "I am afraid that it is only too clear that no systematic effort was made to preserve their libraries on the spot. Among the few score of manuscripts now in the possession of the Dean and Chapter, I have found only about twenty from the old library of Christ Church, and about half a dozen from St. Augustine's." You must go today to Cambridge or the British Museum, if you want to get some notion of Canterbury's former wealth. Matthew Parker, perhaps the most eager of all the Elizabethan book-collectors, bequeathed his unique library of manuscripts to his old college at Corpus. There you will find forty-seven volumes from Christ Church, and twenty-six from St. Augustine's—and they are all picked volumes. Dr. James would have us believe that Parker can surely not have abused his opportunity as Archbishop of Canterbury to enrich his private collection at the expense of the cathedral. That is a matter best left to Parker's biographers. Cambridge at least has no reason to complain.

Taken together, the two monasteries at Canterbury must have been the wealthiest treasure-house of books in the land. Between them they owned at least 3000 volumes—many of them priceless treasures, by modern standards. Here, at St. Augustine's, were the group of sixth-century manuscripts brought to England by the monastery's founder. One is now at Cambridge, another



is perhaps in the British Museum, among the Royal MSS. The others have all disappeared. Christ Church had the Greek manuscripts brought to England by Theodore in the eighth century, and now lost; the Gospels of MacDurnan, given to the monks by Athelstan; the more splendid Gospels of King Canute; and a whole group of manuscripts dating from the days of Lanfranc, with a characteristic script, derived presumably from Bec. Canute's Gospels are now among the Royal MSS. Athelstan's gift is now at Lambeth Palace. The Lanfranc manuscripts are scattered or lost. St. Dunstan's books were not at Canterbury, but at Glastonbury, where he had been Abbot. They have all disappeared. The list could be lengthened indefinitely. The more splendid items have found their way into the national collections, for Canterbury was an obvious mark for Tudor book-collectors. But, even here, how much has perished!

In the North, Durham was a centre that could rival Canterbury in its wealth of tradition; and here Fate has been kinder. The palatine jurisdiction of Durham's bishops gave them an authority that stood between the royal power and the people of the North; and a man like Cuthbert Tunstal could protect the great monastery from the worst indignities of that barbarous age. Mr. Pantin has recently shown how much can be learned from a careful study of the Durham muniments. The treasures of the Cathedral Library are even more spectacular, and it is good news to hear that the Delegates of the Clarendon Press have gone forward with their projected reproduction in facsimile of chosen specimens from this greatest surviving monastic library in England. Two fourteenth-century catalogues of Durham's Library are still extant. They show us that the monastery then owned some 500 volumes. The number must have been far greater at the time of the suppression. Some 300 volumes are still in Durham.

The Gospels of Lindisfarne were once at Durham, whither they came with St. Cuthbert's body in 875. To mediaeval scholars the famous manuscript was known as the Book of St. Cuthbert. Two centuries later

Durham's first Norman bishop, William of St. Carileph, brought the monks of Jarrow to Durham, and with them came Bede's body and (so tradition tells us, at least) Bede's books. The Cathedral Library still houses a seventh-century manuscript of the Gospels "by the hand of Bede", and another equally fine manuscript of the same generation, containing Cassiodore's Commentary on the Psalms. Add to this the series of twelfth-century manuscripts from the Durham *scriptorium*. One of these, the Annals of Symeon of Durham, strayed from the library at the time of the suppression. It has come back to Durham, not indeed to the Cathedral Library, but to the University Library next door, where it is now among the Cosin MSS. And it is pleasant to think that Durham's neighbour, Ushaw College, also owns one or two venerable texts from this great monastic library of the North.

Canterbury and Durham may be taken as types of what England once possessed in her monastic centres. But you would have to add library to library, not merely for the number of manuscripts that have now perished, but also for many another treasure of historic interest, that is now the pride of some academic library or the regret of scholars. Dr. James was probably too generous when he estimated the library of Bury St. Edmunds at some 2000 volumes. He was attempting to reconstruct the contents of this library from a calculation based on the surviving press-marks: a fascinating, but risky and imperfect reckoning. We have more definite evidence for other houses. An incomplete fourteenth-century catalogue of Ramsey Abbey contains more than 600 titles, not counting service-books. A catalogue of the Premonstratensian Abbey of Titchfield, that has recently come to light among the manuscripts owned by the Duke of Portland, lists more than 800 titles, and dates from the year 1400. The surviving catalogue of Austin Friars, York (now in Trinity College, Dublin), gives a double list that is of special interest. The original catalogue of the community library, dating from the year 1372, contains some 250 volumes. To these were added within the next ten or twenty years more than

200 volumes of a more "modern" character, which had been collected by an exceptionally learned and influential friar, John Erghome, friend and admirer of the Black Prince. These are isolated examples, but they give us some notion of what has been lost.

If one convent at York had so fine a library, what must have been the wealth of the great libraries of the four mendicant orders in London, Oxford, and Cambridge? Bale, who had spent his early years as a Carmelite friar in London, knew these libraries well, and his occasional references to them are most tantalizing. Almost two hundred years before his time, Archbishop FitzRalph had complained that the friars were buying up all the best books, and making it impossible for other students to compete with them in learning. It is a curious tribute to their zeal, if not to their discretion. We may recall that another book-lover of FitzRalph's generation, Richard of Bury, went out of his way to thank the friars for the help they had given him in the composition of his *Philobiblon*. Indeed it is more than probable that the *Philobiblon* was largely the work of the Bishop's Dominican friend Robert Holcot.

So much for the evidence of England's wealth in mediaeval books at the time of the suppression. What became of it all? Leland, who had made his survey when the dissolution was imminent, was sore distressed to see so many fine manuscripts scattered and lost when the blow had fallen. He appealed to the king for authority to collect the best manuscripts from all quarters, and bring them together in a Royal Library. "It would be a great profit to all students," he wrote, "whereas now the Germans, perceiving our desidiousness and negligence, do send daily young scholars hither that spoileth them and cutteth them out of libraries, and returning home and putting them abroad as monuments of their own country." It is the age-long cry of English inefficiency!

Had Henry VIII been a lover of true learning, here indeed was a chance of forming a library that would be royal in more senses than one. But Henry did little or nothing. The Royal MSS. that now form one of the

chief collections of the British Museum have grown from the small beginnings of a collection that was made, at Henry's orders, on the lines suggested by Leland. But no systematic effort was made to save more than the most obviously precious manuscripts from the monasteries nearest to the London districts. The editors of the splendid modern catalogue of these Royal MSS. have pointed out in their Introduction that the northern monasteries are almost unrepresented, and that the king's agents made little effort to collect more than a few of the manuscripts that could so easily have been gathered from the southern counties. London must have been full of rare manuscripts in those troubled days. Bale's note-books let us see how many of the texts that he cites were already in the hands of German printers in London, who most probably cut them to pieces as copy for their workmen, if they wished to issue a printed text. And only those texts were printed that were valued by men defiantly contemptuous of mediaeval traditions.

A few years later one of the small group of Cambridge scholars whose influence was so great in Edward VI's short reign set about collecting, for his personal use, mediaeval manuscripts of mathematical and astronomical interest. This was the famous John Dee, who is said to have cast Queen Elizabeth's horoscope at Mortlake, and whose adventures in Germany and elsewhere make curious reading. Dee fell into disgrace as an indiscreet conspirator in 1553, when Mary's accession threatened ruin to his party. Two years later, no doubt in the hope of regaining lost royal favour, Dee issued his remarkable *Supplication to Queen Mary for the Recovery and Preservation of Ancient Writers and Monuments*. Much had been lost since Leland had made his appeal to Henry VIII twenty years earlier. But there was still an immense number of manuscripts in private possession or in hiding, and Dee offered his services to the Queen as a royal antiquarian or librarian. But Mary had good reason to distrust John Dee; and in any case she seems to have had as little interest in scholarship as her father or sister.

Dee's own collection grew during his long life, though

it was nearly wrecked by indignant neighbours at Mortlake during his absence in Germany. Rumours had gone abroad, not altogether without foundation, that Dee was dabbling in black magic; and the good people of Mortlake broke in one day and wrecked the wizard's house. On his return Dee managed to retrieve most of his possessions, and his library was much coveted by book-collectors when he died at Mortlake in 1608. The sale of his books was delayed, through the importunity of his many creditors, for almost twenty years. When the auction took place at London in the winter of 1626-7, Archbishop Ussher was among the buyers, and Trinity College, Dublin, is thus the owner today of a small but most interesting group of Dee's manuscripts.

One of these texts throws unexpected light on the vicissitudes of the famous library of St. Albans, with its almost unique specimens of thirteenth-century English penmanship. Dee owned one small book from the St. Albans library. In itself it is of no value, being no more than a sort of ready reckoner for dates and moveable feasts of the year. But there is a note on the first leaf which lets us see that this book must have been one of his earliest acquisitions: *Joh. Dee 1553. Jan. 28 ex dono magistri Doctoris quondam Abbatis S. Albani*. On the same folio there is an earlier note of ownership: *Ex libris S. Albani. De studio Abbatis*. The last Abbot of St. Albans was the unworthy monk Richard Boreman, who supplanted Thomas Catton when the latter refused stoutly to surrender to the king. Catton was granted a pension after his deprivation, and died in 1552. It must therefore have been Boreman who gave this small book to John Dee in the winter of 1553-4. Was it the only book which Abbot Boreman brought away with him from the great monastery? Most of the extant St. Albans manuscripts are not among the Royal MSS. in the British Museum, but scattered through many other collections. Were they carted off by the king's agents at the time of the suppression, and sold in London? We read that the sacred vessels, jewels, and other treasure of St. Albans were valued at 122 ounces of gold, 2990 ounces of gilt plate, and 1144 ounces of parcel gilt

and silver. Henry liked his loot in cash. Today the St. Albans manuscripts would fetch a price far beyond all these measures of gold and gilt plate. But the book-market in Tudor days was no Eldorado, and I sometimes wonder whether Abbot Boreman, who had a shrewd eye to business, was not allowed to take away such manuscripts as interested him, to dispose of as he might find opportunity. It is no more than a guess, for the small volume which he gave to Dee in January 1553-4 was probably reckoned as his personal property, since it was inscribed from monastic days *De studio Abbatis*.

Leland's complaint that German students were being sent across to pick up English manuscripts makes us wonder whether a large proportion of these scattered treasures did not find their way across the seas. In point of fact, there is little evidence that Germany got much from English libraries. At Wolfenbüttel, where the library of the Protestant Flaccius Illyricus is now housed, there are a few such texts, and I suppose there are more here and there through other German libraries. But the texts of which Leland speaks were most probably texts for use by German printers, and have long since been destroyed. At Erfurt there is a very remarkable collection of English scholastic commentaries, chiefly on logic and physics; but the collection was made in the early fifteenth century by a local German book-lover, Amplonius Ratinck. More widely known are the Latin texts of Wyclif's works, which were almost completely destroyed in England, but have survived in large numbers in Bohemian and Austrian libraries. To these must be added the scholastic texts of Oxford theology and philosophy that are found today in some of the great Franciscan centres of study, for example at Assisi or in the Biblioteca Nazionale at Florence (from the convent of Santa Croce). But these collections were made in the great period of Oxford's scholastic tradition; the texts were acquired by the ordinary processes of the book-trade in Oxford and Paris. An unusually fine collection is in the former library of the Sorbonne, now at the Bibliothèque Nationale. Oxford and Paris were in con-



stant contact, and it was an excellent custom of the Sorbonne that each fellow of the college should bequeath some of his private books to the college library. As generation followed generation, there was thus formed in Paris a library of Oxford and Cambridge texts that is incomparably more representative of English mediaeval learning than any single collection surviving in England today.

There is one small group of English manuscripts, now housed in the Vatican, that may perhaps have found its way across the seas in the troubled days of the suppression. In a very valuable paper which he contributed to the first volume (1914) of the *Collectanea Franciscana*, Mr. H. M. Bannister notes the existence of some texts from the Franciscan convent at Cambridge, which are now among the Ottoboni MSS. in the Vatican. They were formerly in the library of Cardinal Marcello Cervini, St. Robert Bellarmine's uncle and the future Pope Marcellus II. Cardinal Cervini seems to have bought them about the year 1545. Had they been smuggled out of England by the friars of Cambridge? If so, it is good to think that they have now found a resting-place in the Vatican Library.

Here and there it is possible to trace the action of some friendly neighbour at home, who did his best to preserve the inheritance of monastic days. One outlying Augustinian priory at Lanthony in Gloucestershire fared better than its more conspicuous fellow-victims. The last prior of the monastery, named Hart, passed the substance of his community's library to a neighbouring squire named Theyer, whose grandson, John Theyer, added considerably to the Lanthony MSS. by private purchases of his own. Most of the Theyer MSS. were bought by Charles II, and are now in the British Museum. But more than a hundred of the original Lanthony collection, which seem to have been sold separately at an earlier date, were bought by an Archbishop of Canterbury, most probably Bancroft, and are now at Lambeth. Similarly Dr. James has been able to identify a group of manuscripts from St. Augustine's, which were bought in by a local Canterbury antiquarian at the time of the

suppression, passed from him to his grandson, and came finally to the library of Corpus at Oxford.

Perhaps I may be allowed to end these somewhat scrappy notes by two examples of stray monastic manuscripts, which have passed through various hands in the course of five centuries, and are now in Ireland. Manuscripts from Fountains Abbey are rare today, for the ruin of that great Cistercian foundation seems to have been unusually complete. Some months ago I came across a fine vellum manuscript in the Clongowes library which bears the press-mark of Fountains Abbey, and was almost certainly copied in its *scriptorium*. It is a text of the *Panormia Iuris* of Yvo of Chartres, the distinguished French canonist who helped to negotiate a lasting agreement between Saint Anselm and Henry I. Expert opinion assigns the manuscript to the early thirteenth, possibly to the late twelfth century. It was probably copied at Fountains Abbey within fifty years of the death of St. Bernard, and is a fine specimen of the period, with an ancient doe-skin binding. Its fate at the time of the suppression is suggested by a signature which occurs on the first folio of the text: *Henry Slingsby 1647*. This is the famous Cavalier who helped Charles I to get away from the disastrous field of Naseby. In 1647 Slingsby was hiding in his family home at Scriven Hall, some ten or twelve miles from Fountains. He seems to have whiled away some hours of tedium by turning over the leaves of this manuscript, which had probably been carried to Scriven Hall more than a hundred years earlier. Two years later Charles I was executed; and Slingsby followed his master, after a singularly unjust trial, in 1658. His estates were forfeit, his property must have been seized, and we next find the Fountains Abbey manuscript in the private collection of William Nicolson, then Dean of Carlisle and a well-known bibliophile. Nicolson came to Ireland as Protestant Bishop of Derry in 1718, and died in 1737. His book went with him to Cashel, whither he had been translated from Derry in the last months of his life. It passed to a Protestant Archdeacon of Cashel, by name Daniel Hearn; from him to his grandson, another

Daniel Hearn, who was a Dublin barrister in the days of Daniel O'Connell. The Liberator's two sons were at Clongowes when Hearn died in 1821, and we may probably thank him for the appearance of this venerable relic in the Clongowes library, where it has been for the past hundred years and more.

Clongowes owns another English monastic text which has a curious history. Thomas Rudborne was a monk of Winchester, who wrote one or two indifferent chronicles towards the middle of the fifteenth century. His *Medulla Cronicorum* was written, so he tells us in his preface, to remind his brethren at Winchester of the past generosity of England's kings to the Church and the Benedictine Order. Rudborne complains that the Winchester monks of his day were unable to answer obvious questions as to the names of their own benefactors, and he warns his brethren (you may read the text in Wharton's *Anglia Sacra*) that they may some day be punished for their negligence. The people of England, indignant at such ingratitude, may take back what had been given. There is only one copy of this interesting text in England, among the Cotton MSS. in the British Museum. It is an imperfect sixteenth-century copy. The Clongowes text, which represents a slightly earlier edition, dates from the fifteenth century and is in excellent preservation. It may almost certainly be identified with a copy that is known to have been in the library of Sir Simonds d'Ewes, a Puritan book-collector who died in 1650. I suspect that the Clongowes copy was brought to Ireland by some Puritan settler within the next few years. It was in Protestant hands at Kilkenny until the end of the century, then passed to a Catholic Bishop of Ossory, and so to Clongowes.

AUBREY GWYNN, S.J.

## OUR DEBT TO THE EAST

**A**LTHOUGH we resent the attempt on the part of any individual European nation to dominate the rest of the Continent, the domination by Europe as a whole of the world is accepted as a matter of course. If we resist the encroachment of influences described as Asiatic, it is not merely because they are foreign to our traditions, but because we look upon our own culture and civilization as inherently superior, as being, indeed, the only culture and civilization worth considering as such. This, it will be remembered, was the claim put forward by Newman in *The Idea of a University*, and it is the one commonly accepted. According to this, we are the fortunate heirs of a tradition which has a divine right to impose itself on the rest of mankind.

That view might be held to indicate no more than the extension to a group of nations geographically and historically united of the egotism associated with single peoples, but for one circumstance. The particular circumstance which is alleged to give Europe this favoured position has been well described by Johannes Pinski in *Christianity and Race*.

We must therefore put the question [he writes] as to the form in which the Spirit of Christ was made flesh in concrete historical fashion. The fact that the Old Covenant was the type and preparation of the New, might mislead one into supposing that the Spirit of Christ has taken visible shape in typically Jewish forms. As opposed to this, however, is the fact that the Church was entrusted to the *gentes*, and accordingly the visible forms of expression assumed by the Spirit of Christ will be taken from a "Gentile" culture, that is to say, from a culture outside the Old Testament. Historically, the only culture here in question is that of Roman Hellenism, which ruled the Mediterranean world in the time of Christ. And, in fact, I think I may propound the thesis that *the Spirit of Christ was made flesh in the forms of this Roman-Hellenistic culture, in other words, that these forms were called to be the expression and bearers of Christ's Spirit. As the body of Christ was that of a Jewish man, so is the bodily manifestation of the Spirit of Christ in the Church, that of the Roman-Hellenistic culture.*

The implications of this were clearly stated, in a foreword which he supplied for the book in question, by the late Abbot Vonier.

We may put it thus [he said, in explaining Pinsk's thesis], the Holy Ghost did not descend upon the Babylonian culture but upon the one that succeeded it, the Roman-Hellenistic, and this culture is the natural, exclusive dwelling place of the Spirit, so that at once the conclusion imposes itself that any race which accepts Christianity must also accept the essentials of the Roman-Hellenistic culture.

Unfortunately the impression given by these passages is apt to suggest what can be described only as a very serious error. They might convey the idea that it was as pure spirit Christianity came to the West and was embodied in its cultural and institutional forms. As we know, this was not the case. The apostles represented the visible Church, the Mystical Body of Christ. It was not merely a spiritual ferment which they inaugurated; they derived their authority from a fully constituted and hierarchically organized Society possessing characteristic rites and appealing to traditional scriptures. It was precisely because this Body could not be assimilated by the Empire, but maintained its own independent existence and claimed an authority superior to that of the State which occasioned friction. Its members were accused of constituting a new race, a State within the State, a secret and subversive society. To refer to the advent of Christianity as the embodiment in the established forms of the West of "the Spirit of Christ" is therefore misleading. Had it been no more than this the Colosseum might have remained unstained by Christian blood.

The impression created is the more conducive to error since the *ecclesia* was not in all respects a new society, but was the fulfilment of a corporate life identified with a particular people of Semitic origin. It was no abstract humanity which Christ assumed. Not only did He become Man but He became a Jew. Throughout His life He conformed with the customs of His people. So far was He from repudiating the racial and

historical context in which His nativity placed Him that He claimed to be the expression of its inmost spirit. In other words, He was the Jew *par excellence*, the ideal Hebrew, the long-expected Messiah. It was as the Anointed One that He was first proclaimed, and it is this title which He still bears even on the lips of those who practically deny its racial associations. His death and resurrection and the subsequent coming of the Holy Spirit did not cancel these ethnological connexions and constitute Him the Universal Man without racial affiliations as conceived by liberal theologians. When Christianity passed out of the nationalism of Judaism and became a universal religion this was effected in the name of that Hebrew tradition which Jesus is supposed to have repudiated but which, in truth, He fulfilled. That it became universal was not due to the impact of the Gentile world; its universality was the legitimate development of what was already implicit in the traditions of those who called themselves the children of Abraham.

The conception of God as One claiming universal sovereignty which characterized Christianity had been already proclaimed by the prophets of Israel, as had, also, His holiness, and the fact that He demanded obedience to a moral code which reflected His own character. Belief in the dignity of human nature as derived from the fact that man was made in the image of God and in the kindred fact that all men are the children of the same Father were first enunciated by the servants of Jahweh. These truths, mediated by Christianity, with all their immeasurable consequences for western civilization came to us from the East. They came to us not in the abstract form of Greek philosophy, but in the historical context of the Jewish people. Though it is in the Christian Revelation that they attain their sublimest form, it is not in that Revelation these beliefs are first found.

The very fact that Christianity was not dissipated as a vague movement but was conserved in an organic society is in conformity with Jewish experience. Israel had been a definite and visible community, distinguished



as the People of God from all other societies, and the Apostles could no more think of themselves and their fellow-disciples as an undefined body whose members were known to God alone than they could have thought of Jews as forming such a body.

That the messianic movement which had been initiated by Jesus of Nazareth was regarded by His followers as the main stream of Hebrew development and continuous with Israel's past cannot be in doubt. There is no trace in the New Testament of the idea that Christianity was a totally new departure without historical ancestry. When Gentiles joined the ranks of the believers they were viewed as being grafted on to the ancient stock and were congratulated on being incorporated into that Family of God to which belonged the promises made to the Patriarchs and Prophets. What was called the New Covenant, guaranteeing the invincibility and permanence of the Church was but a spiritualized version, sealed with the Blood of the crucified Messias, of the Old Covenant. When, therefore, Pius XI, in a passage quoted by M. Maritain in his lectures on anti-Semitism, reminded his audience that in the Canon of the Mass Abraham is described as "our Patriarch" and asserted that "spiritually we are Semites", he was accurately reflecting the attitude of the New Testament writers. It was this visible and organized Body, to be known thereafter as the Catholic Church, which drove a wedge of orientalism into the decaying *corpus* of the Empire. To represent what happened merely as the permeation of that *corpus* by the discarnate "Spirit of Christ" is to give a false impression. The Blood which was injected into the veins of a dying Europe was the supernaturalized racial blood of a Semitic people carrying with it an hereditary strain matured through countless centuries issuing in certain definite beliefs and practices.

The effect of this on the native civilization of the West was such that it is scarcely an exaggeration to say that it was Asia which recreated Europe. It did not merely save the Latin-Hellenistic culture but transformed it. Hebraic ideals entered into the very fibre of

the new, mediaeval order which emerged from the Dark Ages. They were seen in the supremacy which the Church claimed over the State, in an educational system which grouped itself round the study of theology, in a legal code which corrected the favouritism shown towards the powerful and the rich by Roman Law, in guilds which ennobled manual labour and upheld fair dealing in commerce. The Crusades, inspired by reverence for the Land in which Christ had lived, brought Europe into actual contact with the East and were thus the cause of innumerable social and economic changes. Through popular religious plays the stories of the Bible became the property of the common people and, as Professor Owst has shown, in that way contributed an important factor to the development of the drama. When the revival of interest in pagan literature and art known as the Renaissance partially submerged this Semitic heritage the result in important respects was disastrous.

This summary, necessarily brief, deals only with those oriental influences traceable to Jewish sources through the medium of the Christian Church. The survey might be greatly extended if we were to include the potent effects of the Semitism, not unrelated to the Hebrew tradition, of Moslemism. Even the recovery of its own classics Europe owes largely to Arab scholars. "Western culture," says Mr. Christopher Dawson in *The Making of Europe*, "grew up under the shadow of the more advanced civilization of Islam, and it was from the latter rather than from the Byzantine world that mediaeval Christendom recovered its share in the inheritance of Greek science and philosophy." A notable example of Islamic influence is found in a sphere regarded as peculiarly European. In *The Everlasting Man*, Mr. G. K. Chesterton, with all his customary brilliance, traced the chivalric code to the story of Troy. "This," he wrote, referring to the fact that it imparted dignity to the defeated, "was one of the traditions that did truly prepare the world for the coming of Christianity and especially of Christian chivalry." Mr. Dawson, however, gives a different account of the matter. In an essay on "The Romantic Tradition", he writes :

Of course, if we assume that the ideals of chivalry and courtesy which ultimately became so characteristic of mediaeval society were of purely native growth, then there is no difficulty in ascribing a similar origin to the rise of the new Provençal literature. But it is just this assumption which is open to criticism. In the tenth century the higher culture of Christian Europe was Latin and ecclesiastical, while the feudal society was still almost barbarian. In Moslem Spain, on the other hand, there existed a rich and brilliant society which had already developed a characteristic type of chivalry.

The mention of Spain reminds us of the special degree to which that country is indebted to the East. Not only does it share with the rest of Christendom that Hebrew heritage conveyed by Christianity to which reference has been made, but it is under obligations to the East in other ways. The writer just quoted has given us a vivid picture of Moslem culture in Spain and then, not without justification, adds: "All this brilliant development of culture is completely ignored by the ordinary student of mediaeval European history. It is as though it were a lost world which had no more to do with the history of our part than the vanished kingdom of Atlantis." Even this is not all. Through the *Marranos*, or Jews professing conversion, the blood of that race became an influential factor in Spanish life. Though the article contributed to *THE DUBLIN REVIEW* for October 1932 by Dr. Cecil Roth may be judged as that of a biassed advocate, his statement on this point can be scarcely questioned.

The Law, the administration, the army, the universities, the Church itself [he wrote], were all overrun by recent converts of more or less questionable good faith, or else their immediate descendants. They thronged the financial administration, for which they had a natural aptitude, protest being impossible. They pushed their way into municipal councils, into the legislatures, into the judiciary. The wealthier among them intermarried with the highest nobility in the land. Within a couple of generations there was barely a single aristocratic family in Aragon, from that of the King downwards, which was free from the taint of Jewish blood,

Special mention of Spain in this connexion is justified by the fact that it was the recent Civil War in that country which in certain quarters raised to fever heat enthusiasm for the cause of our "western" civilization. The struggle was represented as concerned with the preservation of "European" traditions threatened by the alien forces of Communism, these latter being sometimes identified with Asia. The same protagonists, however, are now discovered in the larger conflict raging in our continent. Thus, in a recent issue of the *Weekly Review*, under the heading, "Asia Reaches the Rhine", Mr. Hilaire Belloc wrote: "The Communist movement, directed from Moscow, is cosmopolitan. It was organized in its beginnings by an intensive Jewish element. It was not specifically Russian, yet it was obscurely Asiatic. Its roots were in Asia, its philosophy necessarily and violently anti-Christian, not anti-Christian after the fashion of the occidental pagans, but of Asia." In view of the facts recalled in this article, it will be agreed, I think, that such statements may give a false and even a dangerous view of the situation. By obscuring the fact that the European order is established on Asiatic foundations unforeseen consequences destructive of that order may ensue. It was precisely the antithesis of East and West which was invoked to justify the Nazi attack on the Jews and on Christianity as a Jewish religion. It is not impossible that a Europeanism which refused to acknowledge its debt to the Orient might produce similar effects on a larger scale. This continental patriotism, when it adopts an exclusive attitude, may easily lead to the condoning of pagan ideals known to be of native origin and to the condemnation of Christian traditions recognized as emanating from the East. To cut ourselves off from the main source of inspiration would be fatal to all that is of most value in the life of the West and would deprive us of that right claimed by Johannes Pisk on behalf of our civilization to impose itself on the rest of the world.

It is not denied that much of the evil afflicting the world at the present time is of oriental origin. A pseudo mysticism supporting the messianic claims of a materialis-

tic proletariat is a conspicuous feature in the situation as are also certain pernicious activities of international finance. And these, to no small extent, must be placed to the discredit of Semitic agencies. Indeed, when we view the contemporary crisis in a detached way it is seen that, though Europe is the battlefield, the combatants are both Asiatic. Penetrating to the heart of the conflict, we find Semite ranged against Semite. Our part is defined as that of assisting the victory of those Semitic elements in the European order which have been mediated by Christianity.

But this involves a costly act of humility. We have so closely and for so long identified the Faith with our continent that the discovery and acknowledgement of its oriental origin must prove difficult. Are we who have looked down with contempt on the "lesser breeds" of the East to accept the description of Europe as both geographically and spiritually an isthmus of Asia? The thought is almost intolerable. It must be confessed that there has been not a little arrogance in our championship of the West. Nor is it only arrogance of which we have been guilty; there has been robbery on an extensive scale. It might be said that, in some cases, we have not so much borrowed Christianity as stolen it, claiming as our private property and peculiar possession what we originally received by the grace of God and the magnanimity of those Jews to whom the Revelation first came and who, in the person of the Apostles and notably in that of St. Paul, invited the Nations to share with them the Divine Banquet. Our confession must go further even than this. To what we have stolen we have, in some instances, given an occidental character alien to its genius. Our Christianity too often has been interpreted in the terms of a materialistic civilization to an extent that has made it almost unrecognizable. The original Hebraism has been overlaid by Latinism, Gallicanism, Teutonism, and by Anglo-Saxon imperialism to an extent which has obscured the real genius of our Religion. The confession of these sins is a harder task than the toils of a war undertaken in defence of our traditions, but unless that task is performed the war

will be fruitless. Europe can secure its Christian Faith and institutions only by what might be called a pro-Semitic movement. That anti-Semitism is incompatible with Christianity we have learned from Pius XI. But something more than that can be said on the question. There is urgent need at the present time of viewing the Faith in its true historical and racial context. St. Paul declared that the Jew was first both in honour and dishonour. Our anti-Semites have remembered the latter and denied the former. It is our duty, without denying the supreme culpability of the Jew, to acknowledge his spiritual priority as the original recipient and first interpreter and apostle of Christianity. In this acknowledgement is also involved the confession that even for what we call our "western" civilization and culture we are deeply in his debt.

STANLEY B. JAMES.



## CARMEL IN PERSIA

*A Chronicle of the Carmelites in Persia and the Papal Mission of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries.* Two volumes. (Eyre & Spottiswoode. £2 2s. net.)

IN 1927 the late Sir Hermann Gollancz published part of the original diary which had been kept intermittently by the Carmelite friars, missionaries at Basra\* ; and in 1934 the Archivist General of the Discalced Carmelites published a further portion of the same chronicle.† The anonymous compiler of the work now under review was moved to inquire whether accounts also existed of the mission at Isfahan, mother house to Basra, and this preliminary inquiry led to research regarding the whole question of the Carmelite missions in Persia. The compilation of the resulting *Chronicle of the Carmelites in Persia* necessitated immense labour and meticulous research, chiefly among some four hundred bound volumes of documents in the archives of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, as well as work on the archives of the Discalced Carmelites.

The circumstances attending the Carmelite mission to Persia, its origins and development, require some introduction ; indeed when the facts of the beginning of the Discalced branch of the Carmelite Order are remembered, it seems at first sight extraordinary that this mission to Persia should have been undertaken by them at all. The reform in the Order carried out by St. Theresa with the aid of St. John of the Cross, resulted eventually in the constitution of a separate and independent branch—the unshod or Discalced Carmelites. This reform was first and foremost a return to the ancient discipline of the Order which bound its members to a rule of solitude and penance, fitting conditions for the complete living of that life of contemplation aimed at

\* *Chronicle of events between the Years 1623 and 1733 relating to the Settlement of the Order of Carmelites in Mesopotamia (Bassora).* Edited with translation and notes by Sir Hermann Gollancz, M.A., D.Lit. (Oxford: 1927.)

† *Chronica Bassorensis Missionis Carmelitarum Discalceatorum, annis 1733-1778.* Ed. Fr. Ambrosius a Sta. Teresia. (Rome: 1934.)

by the Primitive Rule. The first Carmelites who came to Europe towards the middle of the thirteenth century were hermits; the Order, in adapting itself to new conditions of life, lost many of the eremitical characteristics of the primitive rule, and finally became a mendicant order. After St. Theresa had established the nuns of the reform and had obtained permission to found a house of friars living under a similar rule to that of the nuns, she was joined by St. John of the Cross; and, in 1568, the little house at Duruelo was founded where, in absolute poverty, St. John and his first companions began the first house of the Discalced friars.

From the very beginning, however, the friars at Duruelo set about the evangelization of the hitherto neglected neighbouring countryside. These missionary activities of the early members of the Theresian reform appear at first sight paradoxical, more especially as the Discalced friars, no less than the nuns, were founded in order to bring about the re-establishment of those observances which favoured a contemplative life. But it has only to be remembered that the great contemplatives of all ages have ever been filled with the missionary spirit: witness St. Gregory the Great, St. Augustine, St. Bernard, or in our own day Charles de Foucauld or St. Theresa of Lisieux. Indeed St. Theresa of Avila in the very foundation of her reform had a missionary end in view: she was greatly influenced by the ravages of the Protestants in Europe, and hoped that the prayers and penances of her nuns would do something by way of reparation.

After the death of St. John of the Cross it was decided by the Chapter that no foundations should be made outside Spanish possessions, and in order that there might be members of the new branch of the Order in other countries, especially in Italy, the Holy See approved the foundation of the Congregation of St. Elias, entirely separate from the Discalced Carmelites in Spain. Thus until 1876, when the two branches of the Discalced were united, in addition to the old stock of the Order, the Calced Carmelites, there were two autonomous branches of Discalced Carmelites: the Congregation of Spain,

whose houses were confined to that country and its possessions, and the Congregation of St. Elias with houses in other parts of the world.

From 1617 onwards the Congregation of St. Elias was divided into provinces, and spread to France, Belgium, Germany, Poland, Austria, and elsewhere, and undertook missions in Persia, the Indies, Armenia, Palestine, and Syria, and as far afield as China, not to mention its missions, more difficult and hazardous in many ways, to the Protestants in Europe, particularly in Holland and England. An interesting sidelight on the missionary spirit of the Order in the seventeenth century is provided by the history of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, which, to some degree at least, owes its origin to the activities of two Discalced Carmelites. The idea was proposed and a scheme sketched out in two books by the Venerable Thomas of Jesus: *Stimulus Missionum* (Rome: 1610) and *De Procuranda Salute* (Antwerp: 1613); much of the money for the establishment of the Congregation was collected by the Venerable Dominic of Jesus Mary, who was famous as a wonder-worker in the seventeenth century, and for his part in the great "victory of the White Mountain" of the Imperial troops against the Bohemians in 1619.

The desirability of undertaking missions to the heathen had been debated among members of the newly formed Congregation of St. Elias, and finally the matter was laid before the Pope, Clement VIII. Clement already had in mind the project of sending emissaries to the court of Persia, and accordingly proposed this field of activity to the Carmelites. After further study of the question the friars produced a memorandum in which the undertaking of missions was asserted to be in accordance with the ends of the Order. When the Pope read it he could not forbear to cry out "In Persidem, in Persidem!" Fired with the Pope's enthusiasm the Carmelites decided to make this country the scene of their labours.

Although doubtless the first Carmelite missionaries to Persia had in mind but one object—the preaching of the Gospel to the infidel and the reconciliation of

schismatics, it is important to realize that Clement VIII who sent them, was

primarily using them as legates to forward his policy, which was to protect Christendom against the Turks by developing friendly relations and ensuring direct and reliable communications and negotiations with the ruler of Persia. In a sense these first Carmelites were not free agents, but doing another's bidding; and the importance for the reader lies in grasping this and the dual rôle which lasted for many years and coloured their work accordingly: this dual rôle predominated in the first twenty-five years of their stay, but many times in the course of their story came to the front, and thereby altered their status in the country. To spend days in public attendance at the court, to be with the Shah at his camps and follow his military expeditions, to drink and eat with him, ride on horseback, mix with the seculars from other European countries, above all with the Persian nobles, may have been unsatisfactory in the eyes of their Chapter General as being remote from the strict life expected of their Religious . . . but those worthy and capable fathers on the spot realized better that they must not refrain from doing their best in the guise of envoys to serve the interests of His Holiness, which would be in fact to render the highest possible service to the Faith, if such a course contributed to the overthrow of Turkish power and its terrible menace to Christianity at large. (Page 10.)

Pope Clement's policy in placing a mission, both religious and diplomatic, in Persia, was part of his campaign against the Turks, by which he attempted to organize a double attack, from Europe on the one side, by the Persians on the other. The first step, then, was the establishment of a treaty between Persia and the Holy See. The book under consideration treats this question very fully, giving not only the facts as they concerned the Carmelite mission, but a very complete summary of the history of the relations between the Holy See and Persia, with a good deal of information, necessary to the purpose, concerning the Turkish menace to Europe and the steps taken to combat it.

The first band of Carmelites to set out for Persia left Rome on 6 July, 1604; they were three fathers, a lay-brother, and a Spanish soldier. Their superior was

Father Paul Simon of Jesus Mary who afterwards became the seventh Praepositus General of the Order. They arrived in Prague on 1 August, and by 23 September were at Vilna where they were warned that the internal condition of Russia, on account of the civil war then raging, might render their progress, if not impossible, at least very difficult. In spite of very real hardships they continued their journey through Russia, and after delays arrived in Persia, some ten miles from Baku, on 27 September, 1607.

The Carmelites were kindly received by the Shah 'Abbas I, and having presented the papal letters were by him given the use of a house at Isfahan and gifts. Father Paul Simon was obliged to set off almost at once to carry back to Rome the reply of the Shah; his brethren he left at Isfahan to await his return. The Shah expressed himself pleased with the Pope's plan and promised to help by attacking the Turks as soon as he had news of the plans of the European forces. It was during his stay in Rome that Father Paul Simon drew up a lengthy report on conditions in Persia and a detailed description of the country. He gives a shrewd estimate of the work awaiting the missionaries and his ideas on the qualities they should possess.

As regards the results that we can obtain in Persia, we are of the opinion . . . that we can hope for some with the help of the Lord God, because they allow us to preach, ask questions and listen to what is said to them . . . I think that conversions among the Armenians would be assured . . . It is unnecessary that the "labourers" should be well versed in theology (although that can do no harm) because they (the Persians and Armenians) are not very subtle in bringing forward difficulties. What is more requisite is personal holiness, and to set a good example, to have charity and deal pleasantly with the people there, and to become liked . . . The third requisite is that the "labourers" who go out there should show great disdain for wealth and accept nothing, because, if they accept money, the people think that they go there to accumulate it, or earn their food. They will have to display great poverty in their persons, their garb and their living, and to give away in alms what they have to the poor, especially to infidels. (Page 162.)

The principal house of the Persian mission was, of course, always that of Isfahan; it was in occupation by the Carmelites from 1609 until 1757; but it was never the property of the Order, as it had been assigned merely for their use (by *tuyyul* or *khaliseh* as it was called in Persian law). In or about 1757 it was seized and occupied by a Persian on account of the non-payment of a debt of some 250 scudi. The friars varied in number from seven in 1636, in 1638 eight, in 1675 nine, to four only and a laybrother in 1692; by 1702 this number had dwindled to two,

whose business it was to read the Gospels over sick infidels, men, women, and children, who daily come in large numbers to beg this favour, wherefore when they (the fathers) perceive some infallible and near peril of death, they baptize the children: indeed during the past sixteen years . . . they have baptized more than seven thousand, all dead, none baptized remained alive. (Page 1039.)

A house was founded on the small island of Hurmuz, a Portuguese possession, in 1612; it was intended to be the noviciate house for the whole mission. It lasted, however, but a bare ten years, throughout which time its existence was continually in jeopardy from the opposition of the Portuguese Augustinians already established there, and the refusal of the Viceroy and Council in Goa to grant a licence for the foundation. The house came to an end when Hurmuz was surrendered by the Portuguese to the Persians who, profiting by the help of the English, had been able to capture the island. Even during their short stay on Hurmuz the Carmelites found plenty to do among the Christian inhabitants, and were able to preserve the faith of some of the Portuguese who were in Persian hands; the friars acted, too, as interpreters and intermediaries for the Portuguese authorities in their difficulties with the Persians.

A more permanent establishment was that at Shiraz, which was founded with the double end of missionary activity and also "the perfection in the knowledge of the language and religious laws (of Persia) which might be



attained there". It lasted down to 1715. Julfa, a suburb of Isfahan, which was created by 'Abbas I as a residential centre for his Christian subjects, was the site of another and important foundation. Nearly all the Christians in Julfa were in fact Armenians (the so-called Gregorian schismatics), so that the new suburb came to be looked on by them as their own especial preserve. Relations between the Carmelites and the Armenians, though cordial down to 1640, became more strained when the friars, turning their attention to the missionary work which could be done among the schismatics, founded a house at Julfa in 1691. A school was begun which soon gathered some eighty boys for instruction, and the Papal Jubilee was celebrated with much ceremony in the new church. It is easy to imagine the annoyance of the Armenian Vartapets at these activities; they presented a memorial to the Shah against the Catholics. One of the Carmelites gives an interesting account of his relations with the Antonian monks at Julfa.

In his book *Voyages d'Orient*, Father Philip of the Most Holy Trinity speaks thus of these Armenian religious :

(They) call themselves monks of St. Antony, and . . . are very like us in their way of life: for they fast a great deal, observe abstinence from flesh-meat . . . are clothed in a black mantle of the shape of the habit in which St. Antony is depicted . . . they have hair-shirts constantly next their skin. On the other hand they do not go bare foot: they wear beards: their cells resemble tombs, so small as hardly to take their bodies, and they sleep on a mat on the ground. They are very kindly to us (i.e. the Carmelites) on account of the similarity between their observance and ours, and especially in abstinence from flesh-meat. They celebrate Mass rarely, but, when they do, it is with great solemnity. (Page 320.)

Other residences of the mission were that of Kharg (a small island in the Persian Gulf), Bandar 'Abbas (but no church was built there), Bushire, Tatta, Goa, Diu, Masqat. Basra requires more than passing notice. The mission there was founded in 1623, and although it was

not in territory under Persian sovereignty, was an integral part of the Carmelite mission to Persia and the Indies, until it came under the jurisdiction of Baghdad in 1768. It was at Basra that the Carmelites became first acquainted with the curious sect of the Mandeans—the so-called Christians of St. John—and in all probability they were first made known to Europe by the information passed on by the Carmelites, particularly through a book (published in Rome by the Congregation of Propaganda in 1652) *Narratio originis rituum et errorum Christianorum Sancti Joannis auctore P. F. Ignatio a Jesu Carmelita Discalceato*. Many of his ideas on the subject have been proved in later years to rest on slender evidence, and some of them to be completely false; such is the common lot of pioneers. Efforts were made by the Carmelites to effect conversions among the Mandeans, and several of them were in fact baptized. By far the greater number, if not all, appear to have become Christians for the sake of the material advantages they hoped to obtain by pleasing the missionaries. One of the missionaries, Fr. Anselm of the Annunciation, writing from Basra in 1660, sums up these people succinctly:

Ordinairement partout si quelqu'un d'eux se fait Chrestien c'est afin, ou que l'on leur fasse prester quelque argent . . . ou bien soubz l'esperance que . . . le révérend Père Vicaire de cette maison le fera employer par les Anglois, Holandois ou aultres marchands avec lesquels ils trouvent beaucoup de profit . . . quand nous aurons fait quelque Sabéen Catholique, si nous voulons le conserver tel, il nous le fault envoyer à Goa, où les Portugais et la Sainte Inquisition auront soin de le faire cheminer comme il fault. . . .

So obvious was the bad faith of these people that in 1679 all attempt at their conversion was abandoned, and only those in danger of death were admitted to baptism.

Baghdad, begun a century later than the other houses, was never, properly speaking, a part of the Persian mission. Its establishment arose from the fact that the Vicars Apostolic who were appointed to Baghdad from

1722 onwards were Carmelites, and had with them companions of their own Order. There are Carmelites in Baghdad at the present day.

The missionaries themselves, during the two centuries covered by the *Chronicle*, were many of them distinguished men. Ten of them became bishops, three were elected to be General of their Order; one had been the holder of an hereditary dukedom and great estates, another was the nephew of a reigning Pope, others had been military officers, aristocrats, courtiers—men who had renounced all to wear the humble Carmelite habit and labour, forgotten, among the infidels of Persia. There were scholars among them, too, fluent translators in oriental tongues, and a botanist of some note. Their lives were hard in the extreme, and their adventures often thrilling. One died as a chaplain on a battle-field in Afghanistan, another was slain on his way home to Europe by way of Russia, two were drowned in gales, several perished in epidemics. Two, returning to the mission after a period spent in Europe, fell into the hands of the Barbary Corsairs and passed years in captivity until redeemed. With all their many activities, as missionaries or as envoys, and in so far as the circumstances of their lives permitted, they kept fervently to the observance of their strict rule; evidence of this peeps out here and there in the documents. The wearing of the habit presented no difficulty, apparently, except for the sandals, for in 1675 one of the religious at Isfahan pointed out in a letter to Rome:

. . . bare feet and sandals are points which are no slight obstacle in missionary work, especially among the Muslims: (a) it is not only difficult, but even impossible, to go into a room belonging to Persians with bare, ugly, damp, muddy feet, without exciting inevitably indignation and opprobrium and rebuffs . . . the more so as the floors of the houses are covered with carpets. (b) For beards we have adapted ourselves to the habit of the country . . . why then should we not adapt ourselves in a matter where there is need? The postures one must needs adopt in bending down to tie or untie our sandals at every door is far from respectable: and yet religious habits were adopted for edification. . . . (Page 448.)

Difficulties of all sorts beset the mission to Persia from the very beginning. It was to be expected that the friars would find their way hard, both at court and in their missionary work. But they were continually in trouble, too, with the Armenians and the Portuguese, and to add to it all their poverty was great. It is lot of the missionary to be poor, and for a Carmelite friar this was no new experience ; but in European countries they were able to count on the support of the faithful for, at least, the necessities of life ; in Persia there were few, if any, faithful to help them, and they depended almost entirely on the small stipends sent out to them from Rome. Through mismanagement these small sums of money did not arrive with any regularity, and for years on end the missionaries were hard put to it to subsist. At the time of the Afghan invasion and the siege of Isfahan Persia was entirely isolated from the rest of the world. The Carmelite Vicar at Julfa, writing to his confrère at Shiraz, paints a harrowing picture :

In the five years that I have been Vicar of this house of Julfa I have not had one single good day, *having always had to live on alms* (begged) . . . I have suffered many afflictions, in particular the famine at the time of the siege and later . . . having been obliged to sell some of the things belonging to the House, both in order to keep myself alive, having found myself with nothing but bread and water, as also in order to pay some debts contracted by me before the siege . . . At present is the season to lay in stocks (i.e. for the winter) and I have not a farthing . . . I have already written how we owed 25 Tumans to the English merchants (i.e. the East India Company), 16 to the *Dutch, with whom was pledged the greater part of the silver of our convent of Isfahan.* (Page 771.)

One can understand therefore why, in the words of the compiler, "no attempt was made to send out missionaries to Julfa after 1752, reopen the house there after 1760, why nothing was done after the abandonment of Shiraz in 1738 to repair the residence or recover its value by a sale, nor why no movement is recorded to redeem the historic convent and fine church with its spacious

garden at Isfahan, mortgaged in 1757 with a Persian creditor for the trifling sum of 25 Tumans . . .”

The Armenians, themselves the unhappy sufferers of much persecution at the hands of the Shahs, behaved no better in their dealings with the Carmelites, although at one time there were considerable hopes of the submission of these schismatics to the Holy See. Julfa has already been mentioned as a suburb where the Armenians predominated, and it was here that the Carmelites did their chief work among them. Father Elias of St. Albert, Prior of the House at Isfahan, from 1682, and later Vicar Provincial, threw himself into this work with energy, concentrating on the Armenians at Julfa, with the not unexpected result of arousing the bitter resentment and opposition of the schismatic clergy. In one of his letters he speaks of “the Armenians of Julfa who do not cease to persecute our Catholics . . . the Bishop named Stephen has prohibited marriages between ‘Franks’ and Armenians”. This was in 1681. In 1682 he writes to Propaganda,

how in this town of Julfa, with the persecution pursued by the schismatics against the Catholics, with the excommunications fulminated against the latter and those consorting with them . . . and many other acts of violence on the part of both the secular and ecclesiastical authority, there still shines a more abundant hope of spreading orthodox faith. . . . (Page 457.)

The methods adopted by Father Elias seem to have borne some fruit, but so aroused the ire of the schismatics that he was obliged to leave Julfa. Afterwards when the residence was established there trouble ensued again for the same reason. In later years, another Carmelite, Mgr. Maurice of St. Theresa, Vicar Apostolic of the dominions of the Mogul in India, passing through Persia, in 1711, sent the following unflattering estimate of the Armenians to the Pope: “Holy Father, all Armenians coming to Italy, and particularly to Rome, deceive your Holiness and the Cardinals: *there* they give themselves out to be Catholics, and *here* they are the greatest persecutors of the Catholics.”

*A Chronicle of the Carmelites in Persia* tells in detail the history of the mission, mostly in the words of the missionaries themselves through extensive quotation from the reports and letters they sent back to Propaganda and to their religious superiors in Rome. It is consequently impossible even to touch on here all the many topics of interest which arise in these letters. One matter concerns English readers more particularly. Sir Robert and Sir Antony Sherley, those political freelances of the seventeenth century, find a place in these pages and a certain amount of new information can be found about them. The Carmelites met Robert soon after their arrival in Persia, and according to one account were the means of his becoming a Catholic. At the opening of the chapel at Isfahan, after the first Mass had been said there another ceremony took place which concerned Robert Sherley more intimately. The following is the account of it from the Fondo Borghese, quoted in the *Chronicle*; it incorporates a description of Antony Sherley :

Don Robert is a man of medium height, fair and beardless, aged about thirty years : he wears in one ear a small ring with a tiny diamond : he is a man of sagacity, but a boaster, pretender and conceited. In Persia he has lived in public as a Catholic . . . He purchased a slave from Circassia . . . who belonged to the Muhammadan faith, kept her as his wife, and because it was made a point of religious scruple and duty he had her baptized by Father Paul Simon . . . and married her . . . He afterwards left this lady in a convent in Cracow together with another Christian slave of his, Armenian by nationality. In public the king ('Abbas I) used to pay him respect, but he has never made use of him in anything.

Afterwards, in fact, the Shah sent him as Ambassador to Europe, more particularly to the Papal Court, begging the Pope to unite all Christian princes against the Turks. On the other hand, another account makes Sherley to have been received into the Church by the Carmelites in 1608, and to have been married on the same day.

*A Chronicle of the Carmelites in Persia* will, it is hoped, serve as a model for future historians of missionary



activities. Its fullness, thoroughness, and clear presentation of all the available facts alike commend it. It appears at first sight to be but a compilation of documents, but repays the sustained labour of careful reading for the exciting narrative it has to unfold. In addition to the narrative proper, which is contained in the first volume, we are given in the second biographical notices of the one hundred and sixty-six friars who are known to have worked in Persia, a summary of the sites and vicissitudes of each house of the mission, and in the appendices the text of the Briefs which are translated in the text, typed transliterations of the originals of the Persian letters from Shahs of Persia to the Holy See and a note on the government of the mission to Persia and the Indies. The volumes are lavishly illustrated with portraits of the Popes, Carmelite missionaries, and notables who are mentioned in the text, strikingly beautiful reproductions of Persian miniatures of the Shahs, and photographs of some of the more unique documents. This book makes a striking addition to Carmelitana and missionary history.

LANCELOT C. SHEPPARD.

## THE YOUTH OF LEOPARDI

**I**T is a hundred years since Giacomo Leopardi was buried hurriedly at dawn in the vaults of the little church of San Vitale by the bay of Naples. Cholera was raging in the kingdom but, although he had not been a victim, Leopardi only just escaped the common grave. The devotion of his friend and the "closing of an eye" of the Minister of the Interior, saved his remains from the last ignominy. To the end he was immersed in tragedy.

It is a tragedy, indeed, that we could not celebrate the centenary as that of a great Catholic poet, second perhaps only to Dante. Leopardi came of profoundly Catholic stock, his earliest upbringing was watched over by intensely Catholic parents, his mother was called a saint by those who might have known better. For if the poor woman was undoubtedly saintly in one sense, it was in the Jansenist fashion; she may never have heard of the heresy, so limited was her knowledge of life, but Jansenistic she was to the inmost recesses of her too narrow mind. To her, in a great measure, may be attributed the loss of Leopardi as a glory of Catholic genius. But if we cannot so acclaim Leopardi, he was, at least, never an atheist, as is so often asserted; his strange mentality and terrible health may have obscured his mind to the fulness of truth and the greatness of Catholicism, but he never ceased to belong to the Church. Leopardi was one of the great poets and, it may be said, one of the great tragedians, although he never trod a stage. His life was his drama and he the player, his disguise the broadcloth of his nineteenth century; for his was really a cinquecento figure, his background a survival of the mystery and minor intrigue of grimmer ages. If Italy had not issued a postage-stamp for the centenary, and European writers had not acclaimed the date, we might find it hard to believe that only a century separates us from that figure of doom. On the other hand, his verse from its clear austerity places him yet further back in time, suggesting, as it does, a thin, attenuated echo of the Divine Comedy

itself, while its sheer, classic perfection harks back to the refuge of his troubled spirit, the "lotus shore" of pagan Greece.

Giacomo Leopardi was the eldest of several sons of Count Monaldo Leopardi and of his wife, Adelaida, "of the Marchesi Antici". So on both sides some of the oldest—probably far too old—blood in the Marches of Ancona ran, or stagnated, in his misshapen body. Unlike the *sciancato*, husband of Francesca da Rimini, the Malatesta whom he recalls and who may well have been among his forebears, Rimini being on the border of the Marches, Leopardi was not born crooked; disease declared itself with his growth and, it was supposed, as the result of his passionate and excessive devotion to study. Leopardi's brothers, with one exception, seem to have played little part in his unhappy home-life. His brother Carlo was his confidant and "twin-soul" and he had a younger sister, Paolina, whom he loved, and there might have been some sort of happy family life in the ancient Casa Leopardi, at any rate among its younger members, had anything so commonplace as happiness been in their horoscope.

Recanati, where Leopardi was born and whose glory the poet is today, is a hill-town some thousand feet above the blue distance of the Adriatic. Edward Hutton,\* with his usual happiness of evocation, describes his walk "in the summer moonlight up to Recanati, some seven miles away in the hills . . . I shall not forget," he says, "the beauty of that way . . . one by one as I went the little cities far away each on a hill-top shone out full of lights . . . to the north across the valley of the Musone, Osino greeted me once more and Castelfidardo . . . to the south across the gulf of the Potenza, Potenza, Monteluppone . . ." and so on, all the music of place-names of a language Leopardi was to chisel to perfection of verse. In the morning when the English writer "unhooked the iron fastening and threw back the creaking casement", to be blinded by the light, the world spread sheer sixty feet below, "a sight almost to stop the heart, so great it was . . . a land-

\* *The Cities of Romagna and the Marches*. Methuen, London.

scape, if it were a landscape and not rather something in a dream".

It might be imagined that such beauty of sound and sight, stretched to the far peaks of the Apennines, inspired the poet in the palazzo which, from the city wall, shared the outspread vision. But it was not so. Leopardi's home-town was for much in his tragedy, for he hated it, hated with a virulent hatred its one long, narrow street which he practically never saw, hated its 7000 inhabitants, "rogues or fools", and everything connected with them and what Hutton calls the "tragic and hospitable little town of grey stone and rosy brick on the hill-top".

Leopardi was born there on the 29 June, 1798, and the date, again, was of bad augury. He came into the world with revolution and found himself at one with its doctrines—the precise antithesis of those of his home. He was a pessimist from his cradle, one whom today we should call a neurasthenic who found food for suffering not only, as was inevitable, in his wretched health, but in life itself. Like most youths of genius he was difficult to live with, but he was, none the less, lovable in many aspects and loved by many, though the affections he most needed he either failed to recognize, or were denied him. His mother, though well-intentioned, was over severe and so austere that the love she, no doubt, felt for her stricken son was scarcely shown him; of the love of women he knew nothing but the pain.

A biographer\* of the poet has remarked that popular imagination needs, and always finds, *someone* to blame for a popular hero's sufferings. In Italy poets are heroes and Leopardi a national glory; a "generous vendetta", says Scherillo, pursued the bugbear held up to "public execration" by Leopardi himself in the person of his own father. "He has no other care," his son wrote to a friend in 1821, "in all that concerns me but to leave me to live in this library where I drag out the days, the months, the years, counting the tick of the clock."

Most of the early biographers and critics accepted the son's verdict, but in 1876 De Sanctis electrified a scan-

\* M. Scherillo, Giacomo Leopardi. I Canti. Hoepli. Milan.

dalized audience at Naples University by telling them to beware of "judging the father by the nerves of the son". Time and research into the writings of the Leopardi family, which seems to have lived pen in hand, have rescued Count Monaldo from the harsh injustice of the invalid. If one accusation be well-founded—that his father misunderstood him—it is at least equally true that poor Leopardi returned the compliment, he believed his father to be a tyrant and a man of iron will. . . . The plain fact is that the enormous mass of the Count's letters to his son—kept by Giacomo himself—prove the Count to have been a weakling husband, but a deeply affectionate father.

To understand the tragedy of the Catholic poet's loss of faith, one must know something of the history, the tragi-comedy of the history, of the parents who so unintentionally helped to bring that loss about. Count Monaldo, quite as much as his eldest son, was a victim of circumstance. He, too, had been a scholar, but at the age of about eighteen, finding that no one cared whether he were educated or not, he characteristically threw up the sponge and studied no more. His library, however, where from the age of ten, and entirely by his own choice, Leopardi spent his days, remained as a wonder to the simple Recanatanesi. There Leopardi became, in fact, what he passionately wished to be, a paragon of learning. It reads, indeed, like a transcript from the Middle Ages—the sensitive, ill-formed boy poring over great folios in the ill-lit library up in the hills, a prisoner beating against bars the wings of genius. For alongside of his passion for learning Leopardi had a passion for escape, to leave the very spot where he could learn. But his prison bars held fast; though they were those of a palace, and in spite of the high birth of its owners, the bars were those of a grinding poverty. For this poverty Count Monaldo was partly responsible. Years before, about the time when he gave up the pursuit of learning that was to be his son's physical undoing, he had set forth with his mother, in all the panoply of *abito da parata*, swinging sword and all, on a state visit to the matriarch-grandmother, the Marchesa

Mosca, at the neighbouring gay city of Pesaro. There the timid eyes of seventeen or so met those equally timid, but enchanting eyes, of the "only heiress" of the family. It was an idyll of the eyes and nothing more beyond "long, singular, and inopportune silences" as the unfortunate Monaldo himself described them later. Added to his excess of gaucheness there was the patrician Italian pride of his mother which forbade her pushing her son's interest and it did not need any tragi-comedy to wreck the situation. Tragi-comedy, however, dogged Monaldo, as tragedy dogged his son. A buffoon-like cavaliere having twitted the "Contino", in the very presence of his heiress-love, with his passion for her, Monaldo, "with cheeks aflame", exclaimed loudly, "It is not true!" and rushed from the room. Naturally that ended the affair, and Monaldo returned to his hills without his love—or her fortune.

Two years later—he was twenty!—it was necessary *da far sul serio*, he was by then the head of the family plunged in debts and difficulties. With characteristic inefficiency he rushed into an engagement with a fortune of 20,000 scudi, repented at once and wanted to back out but was told by a friend it was unthinkable . . . the wedding day was fixed. To distract his mind he burst into the wildest extravagances, ordered "furniture of price", horses, coaches and new liveries, bartered the family jewels for the latest to be got, and built grand stables and coach-houses. To pay for it all there were only the 20,000 scudi, but even they so hung fire that, with a final, glorious descent into the ridiculous, Monaldo wrote a series of *anonymous* letters to the bride's father revealing his distaste for her. Naturally this affair likewise ended leaving, this time, no regrets except for the creditors. Three years later, at High Mass, Monaldo caught sight of his future wife and "did wrong," he wrote later, in not taking his eyes off her. Three days later, at the Corpus Christi procession, he did worse for he, by then, knew her to be engaged but ignored the fact. In brief he obtained her hand. The Antici were delighted, the Leopardi aghast—the lovely Adelaida had a bare pittance. Monaldo's mother went so far as to



appeal to the Pope, who refused to interfere, upon which she went down on her knees to her son; he joined her on *his* knees on the floor of the saloon but, for once, stuck to his guns and took rooms in Pesaro—in spite of its memories—for after the marriage. It took place in the chapel of the Antici and then the couple in disgrace asked leave to “kiss the hands” of Monaldo’s mother and repaired home to do so. A scene in the highest style of old Italian comedy ensued in which the priest-uncle Ettore, the uncle Pietro, and others, with tears and cries, called for reconciliation and the non-departure of the young couple, finally rushing out hatless to Casa Antici to announce it and to order the unharnessing of the horses. Adelaida, from then on, lived with her new family and, twenty-six years later, Monaldo could write of her a panegyric in the grand manner—her conduct was above criticism and admired by all. Doubtfully he added a clause—her character was as different from his own as night from day. As he, too, well knew, this difference played its immense part in the tragedy of their son, issuing into the very bones and structure of its misery.

Adelaida may or may not have returned her young husband’s passion, but if the marriage was one of reason on her side, it was certainly not one of convenience in our sense of the word! The house was no longer on the brink of ruin, it was in the abyss. Pride may have disguised the fact for, at the very worst, horses and carriages and many servants were never discarded, but Adelaida had guessed much for she had actually forbidden Monaldo to buy her a jewel, an unheard of sacrifice for a *fidanzata* where appearances were all but life itself. On the very morning after Monaldo—at what a price!—had made her his own, she rose up to reclaim his home and never laid down the burden. She meant well, she was even heroic. She had “qualities of mind both sane and virile,” says Scherillo, Leopardi’s biographer, but that virility was her family’s undoing, for Monaldo went down before it like a leaf in the wind and never succeeded in rising again or in shielding his children from its effects. For an impulsive, affectionate, extra-

vagant personage, who had at least helped on their common ruin, was disastrously placed in regard to a strong-minded woman with a mission. Once, at least, he tried to play his own hand; Adelaida's was "of iron", but he had resource and strategy—he repaired to Pesaro to speculate. "To my good wife I was silent on the cause of my journey so as not to pain her(!)," he wrote, "and she was content with I know not what excuse." Later he was to own no excuse could deceive her, "not a sigh but had to be accounted for". Naturally the "speculation" went wrong, it also involved 1000 scudi of her dowry. Another affair forced him to take refuge in the fortress of Ancona.

Their debts grew so enormous—they amounted to 48,000 scudi and their income to 6000—that Monaldo had to sign a petition to the Pope and so sign away his liberty. For although the Governor of Loreto reduced the debts by 15,000 scudi on the score of usury, it was to take forty years to liquidate the rest. Adelaida took over the management of house and money, and no wonder! But her hand, if an iron one, was also a lone one, for her stern economy was ill appreciated even by her elders in the palazzo; the Leopardi of that generation were a light-hearted lot and "would not, or could not" take in the position, even the dowager mother-in-law dissipated in inanities the remains of their riches". Leopardi himself always complained bitterly of his parents: "Vile prudence which freezes us and binds and renders us incapable of any great action"—such as his departure, for which he longed, for the great world outside with a "pair and a half of post-horses". To do the parents justice, terror of their sickly son's venturing away amongst strangers tortured both father and mother's heart quite apart from the inevitable difficulty of providing the post-horses and supplies.

For both parents loved their "Giacomino", his mother as much as her nature permitted, Count Monaldo with a touching affection which makes his reputation as a brutal father the more distressing. Over and over again, when Leopardi had at last left home, the Count writes,

with the forms that breeding and loyalty to his wife suggested, that he, who had no money, would *somehow* find a little if his son needed it; if he did need it Giacomino was to say so "to the ear of your father and friend". The small gifts which a richer mother would normally send, Count Monaldo somehow sent off, "a little box of tobacco, a barrel of oil, a case of figs" and other touchingly domestic trifles that Giacomo, far from home, might want. Leopardi himself confessed, on occasions, that his father was "kind (*buonissimo*), has the best heart and loves us but lacks the courage to face our mother even in details". Of his mother her son had little good to say. To his brother Carlo he wrote of her "imperiousness now become insupportable". He entertained too, he wrote, "a diabolic suspicion" that she had opened a letter of his. In print he never mentioned her name, but among his MSS. was found a paper describing some unnamed mother, obviously the Countess Adelaide, says Scherillo, "in all the rigidity and ice of her desiccated person". Yet, once at least, she too must have sent him something—"I so thank and again thank Mama," he wrote, "for her dear gift which I will keep as a relic." Sarcasm was never used by her son or we might suspect the last clause. It is still difficult to sift the facts, but amongst the enormous quantity of letters carefully preserved by Leopardi, only two are from his mother. To our colder mentality they seem affectionate enough, but Scherillo describes them as glacial—and stupid. Possibly plain stupidity explains the poor Countess, or she may have been one of those unfortunate people who cannot show what affection they happen to feel. Carlo, her son, wrote that though she gave her hand to her children to kiss, "never once did she press theirs to her heart", an omission, indeed, in a country of overflowing demonstrations of affection. Even her daughter, the "suave Paolina", wrote, "Mama is an ultra-rigorist person, a real excess of Christian perfection, who puts you can not imagine what doses of severity into domestic details. A really excellent woman and exemplary, she has made herself rules of austerity absolutely impracticable and has imposed on herself duties to her children which are

far from comfortable (*comodi*) for them." A family friend, the Marchese Solari, writing to Count Monaldo himself, alludes "to say it with frankness" to "her excessive severity". Leopardi himself, at any rate, was deeply affectionate; if he was selfish and morbidly self-absorbed, those are the too-frequent defects of genius; if he allowed his mother's distortion of religion to affect his views of the Church and clergy, it must be remembered he was not quite normal; his philosophy, such as it was, he evolved for himself.

The essential tragedy of Leopardi's life was, of course, his loss of faith, for though it was never total, he never derived from religion, as far as can be judged, the smallest help. Yet the name of God is often in his letters, the death he invoked almost daily, "one must await it from God," he wrote. "Speak of me to the Madonna," he wrote, too, to his mother, and it might be contended that this was a mere convention prompted by kindness of heart in writing to the pious Countess but for the fact that he had included Our Lady in the scheme for his Christian hymns. Only one of these—the hymn to the patriarchs—was ever finished, though others were roughly sketched in and included hymns to God, the Redeemer, the angels, Moses, the prophets, apostles and martyrs, and the solitaries—a fairly comprehensive and Christian-seeming list.

The fact is that Leopardi, although a thinker and would-be philosopher, was never logical; he himself scarcely knew what were his beliefs, his life might be said to be one long note of interrogation, as was much of his verse. Even "To Sylvia", "the most perfect among the impeccable poems of Leopardi", written after five years in which he declared himself dead to poetry, and addressed to a dead girl, Teresa Fattorini, daughter of the family coachman, is a pathetic and lovely questioning of the vanished girl he is said to have loved. Does she remember, he asks, the time of her mortal life? Is this present world the one they dreamt of? Its wretchedness the only fate of humanity? Such lyrics as the famous "Canto Notturmo" are pure speculative interrogations of fate and of human destiny,

Why so many stars ?  
 What does the infinite air, and that profound  
 Infinite serene ? What means  
 That solitude immense ? And what am I ?

It is true that, in this case, he answers himself :

This I know and feel,  
 That, of the eternal travels, [of the stars]  
 That, of the frailty of my being  
 Some good and content  
 Others perchance may have ; for me life is evil.

Even that penultimate clause, it may be said in passing, is an unusually optimistic concession on the poet's part, for he saw life as irremediably evil for all, not only for himself, and therein was his most fundamental departure from truth.

Commentators have always attributed Leopardi's want of orthodoxy to the obvious circumstances of his family life, his times and surroundings. It may be questioned, however, whether even in ideal conditions Leopardi's health would have allowed him to come out from among the mists and morbid emanations which enveloped his mind. So intense was his pessimism that it is doubtful whether even had he possessed the full faith he could have vanquished his misery and whether his seemingly unchristian despair was not, rather, an incurable neurosis. In a more scientific age, and in conditions less grindingly restricted, his family would have sought medical aid for his case. It is incredible that any quite normal youth could have inflicted on his surroundings, and on his friends, lamentation so repeated and extreme even in a Catholic country where pain is not regarded as the supreme evil.

This Italian philosophy of patience almost fatalistically accepts the axiom that we are born to suffer—*siamo nati per soffrire*. Otherwise the poet's unhappy correspondents must have jibbed at a pessimism so unwaveringly flung at them and compared to which the Book of Job is light-hearted trifling. "Reading the corres-

pondence of the middle two-thirds of the nineteenth century," says Ford Maddox Hueffer, "is like sitting on a broken column by some grave beneath a weeping willow." But no witticism could do justice to the melancholy of Leopardi. To count the number of times the word despair, or its equivalent, occurs in his letters would wear down a numerator or the most inveterate lover of literary oddities. All the early recognition of Leopardi's genius, in a land where such things matter so greatly, must likewise have been needed to supplement the patience of his readers.

It is a moot point whether Leopardi's ill-health was the result, or the cause, of the intense devotion to study in which he found his only distraction. At the age of sixteen he was already "a perfect Helene" and wrote a treatise on the Roman rhetoricians, a commentary on Plotinus and a history of astronomy; at seventeen an immensely learned work on the classics, and his first odes. They brought him immediate recognition and the friendship of Pietro Giordani, twenty-four years older than himself, who from then on was the object of Leopardi's profoundest affection and the recipient of unending letters of misery and despair. In vain, and constantly, Giordani counselled the common sense so lacking in the palazzo, with less study and plenty of the exercise which we imagine to be the discovery of our own times.

It was to Pietro Giordani that many contemporaries, including the poet's father, attributed Giacomo's loss of faith. Count Monaldo, apparently unaware of Giordani's unorthodoxy, received the writer into the family circle; the event was one that, for all his goodwill, Giordani had been obliged to defer again and again in spite of Leopardi's impassioned impatience. For a brief space it rendered the poet less unhappy. The Count treated his guest with a kindness and courtesy that must greatly have embarrassed the latter considering his position as confidant to the two dissatisfied sons of the house, for Monaldo records his guest's "rigorous silence" as regards both Leopardi and Carlo. Giordani had been, perhaps involuntarily, adds the



Count, of ill-augury to the family—from that date the father considered that he had “lost his sons”. Unfortunately, if the Count is to be considered an accurate reporter of family records, he must most injudiciously have contributed to his son’s revolt, for the father attests in one of his innumerable letters to a friend that Giacomo had never till then been, to all intents and purposes, “out of his sight”, the implication being that this was for the purposes of moral supervision.

As regards Pietro Giordani, he was an honest man and a good friend, as he saw it, to his poor “Giacomino”, but he was a mediocre philosopher at a time when learning in Italy, according to Leopardi, who never wearied of lamenting the fact, was at its lowest ebb. Giordani had adopted the new heretical forms of foreign thought and it is hard to believe that, however loath he may have been to undermine the faith of an unhappy boy so much younger than himself, he can have failed to influence the poet’s outlook. Both he and Leopardi, however, indignantly repudiated the idea. In a letter to the Abate Baruffi\*, Giordani denies that Leopardi “professed unbelief” at all; it was possible, he said, but most unlikely that Giacomo, reserved as he was, should, in any case, have told him so. It was, he added, a most impudent calumny of those who asserted that the poet had accused him of “seducing him to unbelief”; Leopardi would not have said so had it been true, far less as it was so false, for never, never did they even discuss such matters.

Whatever Giordani’s influence, all unknown to himself, may have been, it can, at worst, only have synthesized those of the times. Revolution was in the air as was the liberalism that was to change the face of Europe. It was a fateful moment for Italy, a time of confusion to minds less cursed with the aberrations of genius than that of Leopardi. After the fall of Napoleon, Austria had succeeded France in the north, while the Spanish Bourbons continued to rule, or misrule, in the south; all of Italy outside the Papal States seemed the plaything of governments which were doing their best to

\* Appendice all, Epistolario di Giacomo Leopardi. Viani. Florence.

undermine the faith of the peninsula. Already in 1767 the Bourbons had expelled the Jesuits, while twenty years later the evil Synod of Pistoia was to introduce in all its force the anti-clericalism of the Habsburg, Joseph II—this reacted on that “paganism latent”, says Professor Edmund Gardner, in the genius of the Italian people. The Austrian influence was wholly bad, its policy repressive in the extreme in action, falsely liberal in thought. Prince Kaunitz, its famous chancellor, in power since 1753, was a personal friend of Voltaire and a propagator of the new doctrines—they reached out to the Papal States and the library on the hill-top at Recanati. Vincenzo Monti, the poet and, later on, half-heartedly a friend of Leopardi’s, had been a lay Abbé; he fled from Rome to write anti-religious and republican poems and even an ode glorifying the execution of Louis XVI. He was weak and of no real account, but he added to the prevailing confusion of ideas. Confused they, in truth, were, reforms of all kinds were indicated, change was inevitable; Gioberti, the statesman and unorthodox theologian, openly suggested that the fall of the Temporal Power would benefit religion, though the opinion, very properly at the time, was regarded as treasonable.

The contemporary guides Leopardi chose for himself did little to clear, or steer, his mind. Goethe and Byron he, of course, adulated, while, in philosophy, he had taken Tracy as a master, imbibing the ideology which the French philosopher quite candidly affirmed formed “a part of zoology”, that is of a materialistic biology. Nature assumed for a time the place of honour in the poet’s mind, but even against that well-worn ideal he was to turn as against “the supreme enemy of man, the step-mother Nature”. Through Tracy he had studied Condillac and Locke, absorbing further pessimism from the Englishman’s puritanism and criticism of order rather than strength from his belief in God in whom Leopardi already, and always, believed. “If God exists,” he wrote, it is true, on one occasion, but it is quite obvious that, at the back of his tortured mind, not only the belief in God, but in the divinity of Christ, sub-

sisted. In the rough draft for his Hymn to the Redeemer, he thus apostrophized Him: "Thou hast essayed our life, Thou hast relished its nothingness, Thou hast felt its pain and the unhappiness of our being. . . . Mercy for so much misery, mercy for this Thy poor creature. . . . Time will be when no other ray of hope remaining to me. . . . I shall have recourse to Thee." It was obviously a very limited prayer, yet a prayer it was and humble and, at least, from his heart. Scherillo terms it the last cry of his youth, the prelude to his bitter manhood.

Meanwhile, for a brief hour, a mitigated sort of happiness invaded the prison walls at Recanati. Another cousin, the lovely young Countess Geltruda Cassi, arrived to stay. Even such family visits were an event, this one occasioned by some necessity of being in Recanati for some few days. She was married, but what was that mundane triviality to the sudden, idyllic rapture of a poet's untried heart? Ten days later she was gone and Leopardi wrote long, melancholy letters to the patient Giordani full of allusions all quite mysterious, for except in the matter of abstractions Leopardi was, as Giordani attested, reserve itself. In 1818 his unhappiness at home came to a head; the exasperated youth wrote off to Count Broglio, a family friend, begging him to procure and send a passport. Giacomo addressed long, farewell letters to his father and brother, reproaching the former with his "extraordinary firmness", and much else. The passport, when it came, fell into his father's hands. The Count, so often accused of double-dealing, took it straight to his son, threw it down before him and told his son to act as he thought best. The flight, which was to have been as silent and mysterious as any in the history of the little mediaeval town, was at an end. Leopardi, "angry with himself and others", wrote off an apology to Count Broglio in Macerata: "I have given up my project for the moment," he desperately explained, "not forced to it, or persuaded, but upset and deceived." As usual he was unjust.

"I know I shall be thought mad," he had written in his farewell letter to his father with all the candour of

his nation as to facts—the letter was, incidentally, a citation of the parent before the bar of the son's judgment, "as I know that all great men have been so considered. And as the career of almost every man of great genius has begun in desperation I can bear that mine should so begin. I would rather be miserable than small, and suffer rather than be bored," ennui being fatal, he added, to his health.

Poor Monaldo! Poor Giacomo! For the latter was better at heart than his railing at his father to outsiders would lead us to believe. "I do not wish to forget my duty," he wrote off to the long-suffering Giordani, "I would be unhappy, I alone; I swear to you that if anything troubled me in the resolve I had formed, it was the thought alone of offending my parents, not the perils to which I should have exposed myself. nor the blame of others of which I take no account, nor the death which poverty and privations would soon have procured for me to my consolation. I have always loved my father and will love him."

Leopardi, conscious of his own genius and already adulated by admirers from the outside world, can scarcely be blamed for seeking escape into that world. He achieved escape, after all, before he was twenty-one—the Count sent him to Rome. But, alas! he hated Rome as much as Recanati! Pisa was, on the whole, the place where he was least unhappy, but even there the Count's worst fears for him were verified, he was desperately poor although his father did prodigies in helping out his poverty; he was constantly ailing and—sometimes—even home-sick! He had always, at the worst, wanted to go home to die, but even that rather pathetic hope was not realized, he died without those whom he had really loved but with whom he could not bear to live. An incomparable friend, Ranieri, was with him at the end, "a priest sent for in haste to the nearby Augustinian friary, arrived only in time to bless the body".

It is consoling, at least, to think that from such a family, limited perhaps and humanly faulty, but utterly and sincerely good, and from such a home-town—Leopardi, whether seriously or not, credited Recanati

with 700 friars!—a great volume of prayer will have gone up for his soul.

That Leopardi was naturally good and noble is beyond dispute, those who knew him constantly attested the fact, his work confirms it. His confusion of disbelief, whatever precisely it was, never affected his naturally exalted ideals of living. "Virtue, sensibility, greatness of soul are not only the single consolations of our ills, but also the only possible goods of life," he wrote.\* That his own "greatness of soul" was befogged by mists of the spirit, sickl'd o'er by intollerable suffering of the body, was his seemingly irreparable misfortune in life, it may have proved quite otherwise in that world upon which he entered from the cholera-stricken shores of Naples just over a century ago.

MRS. GEORGE NORMAN.

\* *Epistolario*, Vol. I, p. 125.

## ROBERT BURNS : THAT IMMORTAL MEMORY

"VERSES dip't in dew of Castaly" immortalized Achilles : poets are preserved in rhetoric. An interesting academic thesis might be constructed around the relationship of oratory to literary fame ; indeed there would seem to be some "canonizing" power in rhetoric as applied to the posthumous reputation of literary men ; for once a poet or any great writer has been made the object of the official eulogist he acquires a myth, a legendary reputation, which gradually replaces historical truth. This myth-making tendency is of course stronger in oratorical ages like the mid-nineteenth century, when few "Great Men" could be approached without Dulia, than in a disillusioned epoch like our own which prefers debunking to panegyric ; and in which many once proud full reputations now sag badly : but in the case of writers who have become identified with the ethos of their people, whom Carlyle would have treated under the title of "The Hero as Poet" or "The Hero as Man of Letters", the legendary process continues unhindered, and critical deflation seems powerless to check the rites of popular apotheosis. A case in point is the reputation of Robert Burns. One has only to turn to the Scottish newspapers on the morning of the 26th January to realize that time's fell hand has not defaced the poet's name, and that the spirit invoked over countless banquet tables by the voice of the Scottish race has not become less luminous with the passage of the years.

Last year the heavy columns of tribute in the *Weekly Scotsman's* reports were enlivened by an unusual news-item . . . " . . . the 45,000 inhabitants of the New Jersey town of Kearney proudly welcomed, to the music of bagpipes, an armoured car carrying a first edition of Robert Burns's poems. The book had been loaned to the Methodist Church by Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan. The armoured car was provided by a transport company free of charge".

One hundred and forty-three years ago Fencibles, Infantry and Cavalry lined the streets of Dumfries :



the corpse of a debt-ridden exciseman, the author of those poems, was driven to an "outside corner of the overstocked churchyard" and, to the rattle of three volleys from the awkward squad of the Volunteers, was deposited in "a desirable situation, nine feet by seven, free and unencumbered". For the first time in his short life of thirty-seven years could these adjectives, "free and unencumbered" be used in connexion with Robert Burns. They did not remain applicable for long.

The oratorical obbligate which accompanies Scotland's annual tribute to her bard is not intended for the critical ear. Readers of the poems, as opposed to mere toasters of the memory, are inclined to smile at the mythological concept, part Bentham, part Buchman, part Wallace, before whom, as symbol of the soul of Scotland, the élite of politics and commerce crook the pregnant hinges of their rhetoric on the night of the 25th January. Certainly some assertions, such as the following taken from the daily Press, connote wish-fulfilment rather than criticism. . . . "The personality and genius of Burns made an irresistible appeal to all Scotswomen. . . ." "Burns would have sprung to the support of Democratic Spain, he would have fought in the defence of Barcelona. . . ." "In an age of political slumber Burns taught the fundamental lessons of personal worth that are the basis of democracy, and in an age of religious deadness he proclaimed the eternal value of sympathy, purity and manly virtue which are the foundations of morality."

These are very proper sentiments ; they contain the correct measure of adulatory incense for the honoured bones of a national bard even if they do not leave him unencumbered and free from the classic's duty of providing useful homilies for posterity. But the rectitude of Burns's message is made palatable by human interest ; the immortal, if sombre, memory contains hints of romantic liasons to spice the uplift. Love and whisky are painted into the sterner tints of service, fellowship and democracy : the finished portrait stresses the theme of sobriety and sterling worth ; but there are suggestions of a leer, a slight trembling in one eyelid, which tell the

initiate that their hero, though sound in principle, is nevertheless a "regular guy".

Burns as canonized by modern Scotland is the patron saint of Rotarianism. He offers his devotees a comfortable blend of male jocularly, tepid emotion, sentimental uplift, romantic patriotism, slightly tipsy pathos. He seems to fuse the qualities of the wayside pulpit, the masonic lodge, the Y.M.C.A., and (when the ladies have withdrawn) the richer content of the Stock Exchange story. The ploughboy of Mauchline has become the ideal laureate for the (legendary) commercial traveller. In this apotheosis the armoured car of Kearney, the indulgent Mr. Morgan, and the enshrining Methodist Church are fitting concomitants.

Fashion in letters smiles at this popular concept of Robert Burns. Modern literary criticism finds a certain piquancy in iconoclasm, an illicit satisfaction in converting the universal affirmatives of orthodox judgement. Our Rotarian Burns, however, has had a long cultus: after a century and a half it is difficult to believe that an impostor could have swayed the imagination of an entire people, especially as his writings are so widely known and neither swathed in allegory nor rendered remote by accents of assumed prophecy or pretended revelations. An obvious falsehood, a reputation built upon absolute mendacity, would never have dominated a nation over such a long period. One may agree that in the Scottish worship of Burns much of the incense is misdirected, the ritual adoration badly "socketed"; that the cult is heretical and its object, as Ananias would say, "indeed an idol"; we must be consistent, however, and admit also that this particular heresy contains elements of truth; that, as in the case of all heresies, it is based upon some aspect of orthodox doctrine.

The cult of the Rotarian Burns and the attackers of that cult are both justified; iconophile and iconoclast are equally right. Jean Armour spoke truer than she realized when she remarked, "oor Robin should hae had twa wives"; certainly, for Robert Burns lived a double life. Mentally, as politician, thinker, religious theorist, educated reader and writer of English poetry and prose, he was a

typical man of the eighteenth century : instinctively he belonged to a very different world ; poetically he was in and of the world of the vernacular peasantry whose roots go down into the rich subsoil of the Middle Ages. The distinction implies that the national poet of Scotland was afflicted with schizophrenia ; that our purveyor of uplift and democracy suffered from split personality ; that he was not an Apollo but a Janus. However, the present writer would go further and claim that, from the point of view of literature, of thought, of psychic life, Scotland in the eighteenth century was in a similar psycho-pathic state, "hesitations dividing the swift mind" : that Burns mirrors his people.

The excellence of Burns's early education has been insisted upon by all his biographers. If they are Scots they delight in the picture of the Ayrshire ploughboy reading Fénelon's *Aventures de Télémaque* at the age of fourteen. Scots or not, all admit that no contemporary English lad of Burns's lowly station could possibly have received such an excellent literary upbringing ; that certainly no child of the nineteen thirties in the closes of the Cowcaddens or the steep streets of Greenock or the drab tenements of Blantyre receives anything like it. But Burns's education had little connection with Scotland : Professor Elton has noted the extent of the young man's acquaintance with the English classics ; he deplors the influence of "Sensibility" and approves the scale, concision and rapidity learnt from Fielding and Pope. We would suggest, however, that the influence on the young Burns of these works, and indeed of the whole body of eighteenth-century literature with which he came into contact, was more in the spirit than in the letter. These books gave his mind a direction towards the principles which dominated the thought of educated Europe at the period, and away from the life of the native peasantry of Scotland.

The climate of thought, the tempo of ideas, in educated circles changes from age to age : today the minds of all readers of modern novels and reviews are affected, to some extent, by the terminology of Freud and Marx : in Elizabeth's England the four

points of the mental compass were Castiglione, Lyly, Seneca and Ficino: in the late eighteenth century the thought of educated men received its tone and pitch from the writings of Locke, the French Encyclopedists and Rousseau. The concepts of Deist theology, of secular progress, of egalitarian liberty, of social contract, and of the essential goodness of the natural feelings, these were the moulds in which most educated thought was cast in the years leading up to the French Revolution: they remained unaltered until the writings of Burke and fear of the Terror formed for a time a new outlook.

Of this tone or mood Burns is typical. John Murdoch, his tutor (afterwards Talleyrand's instructor in English), was a disciple of Rousseau and a thoroughgoing left-wing Whig. This man's influence gave the young ploughboy's mind a bias towards the Deist-egalitarian republicanism which lies behind much of the literature of the period in France and England. In addition, Sterne, Richardson and Mackenzie (whose *Man of Feeling* was hailed as a disinfected "Shandy") informed Burns's sensibility with the prevailing sentiment of the Rousseauists. The result of this upbringing is to be found in the poet's mature thought as indicated by his diary and letters; they embody the commonplaces of the anti-religious fashions of the day and of the equally fashionable Revolutionary sympathy which fastened upon the sufferings and injustices of foreign countries and distant peoples, ignoring sharper oppressions nearer home. Burns turned a blind eye to the horrors of slavery among the coal and salt workers of his own country, paid no attention to the miserable lot of the new industrial labourers, but grew extremely excited about the Bastille and the Rights of Man. Left-wingers in the late eighteenth century were as genteely selective in their sympathies, as myopic in their view of liberty and tyranny as the *suppressores veri* in our contemporary Press: their Fata Morgana was the romance of the distant and alien.

On this side of his mind, in his prose and his so-called English verse, Burns was on common ground with his fellow gauger Tom Paine and with the members of the

## Robert Burns : That Immortal Memory 359

"London Corresponding Society", whose founder was a Scottish bootmaker and whose members included Horne Tooke and Thomas Holcroft. His outlook differs little from that of Dr. Price whose sermon preached on 4 November, 1789, exhorted liberal sentiments in the words : "Be encouraged, all ye friends of freedom, and writers in its defence. The times are auspicious. Behold kingdoms, admonished by you, starting from sleep, breaking their fetters, and claiming justice from their oppressors, Now, methinks, I see the ardour for liberty catching and spreading ; a general amendment beginning in human affairs ; the dominion of kings changed for the dominion of laws, and the dominion of priests giving way to the dominion of reason and conscience."

These sentiments are echoed by Burns in the patriotic strains of "Scots wha hae" which weave the bombast of the Marseillaise and the turgid oratory of the Girondins into verses supposedly spoken by a feudal monarch to his knights and clansmen :

Lay the proud usurpers low  
Tyrants fall in every foe  
Liberty's in every blow. . . .

They appear again in the transatlantic salutations of *Libertie . A Vision* :

But come, ye sons of libertie,  
Columbia's offspring brave as free !  
In danger's hour still flaming in the van  
Ye know and dare maintain the royalty of Man.

The phrases spring from the fields of Saratoga, of Valmy and Wattignies, they have little connection with Bannockburn or even with Bothwell Brig or Culloden. In similar vein the lines "For a' that and a' that" express the mood of '92 and the spirit of the Girondins ; but here, as in "Auld Lang Syne" which has become a Rotarian anthem, the original and not ignoble inspiration has so long been steeped in maudlin sentimentality that it is difficult to read them without nausea.

Burns's professedly religious poetry is equally eighteenth century in style and conception. "A Prayer in the Prospect of Death" is mere rhetorical Deism. So also are such verses as "O Thou Unknown Almighty Cause", or "A Prayer under the Pressure of Violent Anguish" which commences with the words "O thou Great Being! what thou art Surpassess me to know". These compositions are so general and abstract in thought and language, so distant from any contact with the individual, that they might have been written by the English Augustans in committee.

That Robert Burns in his serious moments really did think in some such manner is evident from his letters which are uncompromisingly Deist or Agnostic in tone. He writes: "The aim and end of human life is to cultivate an intercourse with the Being to whom we owe life, that unknown Almighty Cause, and to maintain an integrative conduct towards our fellow creatures." "That there is an incomprehensible Great Being is I think self-evident." He addresses Our Lord: "I trust that thy revelation of blissful scenes of existence beyond death is not one of the many impositions which time after time have been palmed on credulous mankind." And once more: "Every fair, every unprejudiced enquirer must in some degree be a sceptic. The universal beliefs of mankind have ever had extremely little weight with me. It is not that there are any staggering arguments against the immortality of man, but that the subject is so involved in darkness that we lack data."

The writer of these opinions is certainly not the fervent supporter of orthodox Presbyterian doctrine so frequently quoted at tributary suppers as a typical Scottish religionist. Even in "The Cotter's Saturday Night", the source of most references to Burns's piety, pompous abstractions and vague periphrases destroy our enjoyment of the otherwise tender, intimate picture, and render the whole thing windy and declamatory. Indeed Burns's religious notions have more in common with those held by Godwin and Robespierre than with those of Calvinist ministers: he would have been more at home before the altar of the "Supreme Being" on the



Champs de Mars than he was in any of the Kirks or Conventicles of Ayrshire.

In religion and politics, then, Burns merely echoed the opinions of educated men around him, who in their turn echoed the fashionable circles of London and Edinburgh. In this indirect manner he reflected in the small mirror of Ellisland and Dumfries the larger world of Franklin and Tom Paine, of Lafayette and Holcroft, of Dr. Price and Mme. Roland. The young Wordsworth was similarly influenced and has testified to the intoxication which these apparently drab ideas could cause when translated into practice by the first Revolutionaries.

This side of Burns's mind has little to commend it to the study of disciples ; as we have seen, it is not original and contains nothing peculiarly Scottish. Men thought as he did in Boston and Belfast, in Birmingham and Lyons : nor did Burns hold to these opinions with any great courage. He was no model of Republican zeal. When his opinions became dangerous, when their expression was threatened with pecuniary loss (as in the episode of the four Carronades), he retracted with some vigour. There is, no doubt, a refreshingly modern ring, a preluding of contemporary Lowings and Blumeries, about his remarks concerning the executions of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette : "What is there in the delivering over a perjured Blockhead and an unprincipled Prostitute to the hands of the hangman, that it should arrest attention ?" ; and also in his pious wish, when fortified by night and alcohol : "May the last king be hanged in the entrails of the last priest". But at the first hint of danger Burns drew in his horns : an extremely sympathetic biographer, Mrs. Carswell, writes : "He abased himself in disingenuous disclaimers and needless apologies." Burns ended satisfactorily and prudently in National Service under the uniform of the Royal Dumfries Volunteers. A military funeral and the volleys of the "awkward squad" as well as the armoured car of Kearney and the indulgence of Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan are a sufficiently ironical commentary upon this side of Burns's life and thought.

A well-read exciseman with mildly Jacobin tastes, a  
Vol. 206

typical egalitarian-Deist, such is the Burns who speaks to us in his correspondence and diary ; and such is the Burns, suitably softened and sterilized, diluted with commercial camaraderie and uplift, who leers at modern Scotland through the sentimental haze of commemorative banquets. Fortunately the poet has another soul side :

Cross a step or two of dubious twilight,  
Come out on the other side, the novel  
Silent silver lights and darks undreamed of. . . .

As we have suggested, a dualism in the life of post-Reformation Scotland was reflected in the double life of its bard. Burns "ideologically" was typical of the international outlook of the educated classes of his day : as a poet, instinctively and emotionally, he mirrored, echoed, interpreted, the vernacular life of the people. Robert Burns's Scots poetry sums up and crystallizes the life of the peasantry as it existed in the contemporary countryside, and as it existed also in the popular Lallan poetry which had carried down the tradition of Scottish peasant life so fully and so accurately that it may be spoken of and regarded as a species of race memory. Burns's Scots poetry is not international nor is it restricted to the eighteenth century : it is intensely local and even parochial, but, since its roots are embedded deep in time, it bears in its flowering something of essential Scotland, mutilated it is true, spiritually decapitated, but essential, primitive, eternal Scotland none the less. Scotland may have thought with Calvin and Knox, or later on, with Montesquieu and Rousseau, just as today outside the Church she thinks with Marx and Freud : Scotland felt with the rhythms and imagery whose inspirations and origins are coeval with the old independent kingdom of the North.

Internal divisions had always been Scotland's tragic flaw ; in politics they had involved her in catastrophe after catastrophe, until ineluctably they brought about the ultimate dissolution of religion and nationhood : after the Reformation, a similar divided life in her literature, the schizophrenia of the Northern Muse, led just as inevitably to disaster. Of this disaster, the final

tragedy of a nation's mind divided against itself, the writings of Robert Burns form the most unhappily perfect example. As is the case with every catastrophe in the mental life of races and nations, the primary causes were religious.

The Reformation sabotaged the ethics of Europe : it also sabotaged the imagination and sensibility of the Scottish people. Mr. William Power writes : "Knox and his successors not only discredited Scotland's literary treasures by associating them with Papacy and paganism, but made them largely obsolete by bringing in current English for serious discourse." The triumphant progress of Calvinist dogma from its English bases was accompanied by a linguistic conquest which imposed an alien dialect upon the people in the very act of robbing it of its ancient and native faith. Knox "knapped Suddrone." According to J. H. Millar in his *Literary History of Scotland*, which has no Catholic bias, "The use in Scotland of an English version of the Scriptures and the currency of Knox's controversial pamphlets were the most effective agents at this time in undermining the position of the Scots tongue as a literary dialect."

Patriotic Catholic controversialist, were swift to accuse the Calvinists of this betrayal of the native tongue. Ninian Winzet, Master of Linlithgow Grammar School and later in life Abbot of the monastery of St. James in Ratisbon, threw the charge of linguistic treachery in Knox's teeth : "Gif ze throw curiositie of nouationis hes forzet our auld plane Scottis quhilk zour mother lerit zou, in tymes cuming I sall wryte zou my mynd in Latin, for I am nocht acquyntit with zour Southeroun." John Hamilton in his *Catholik Traictise* made a similar patriotic protest when speaking of the Calvinist *Negative Confession* : "Gif King James, quha hering ane of his subjects knapp Suddrone declairit him ane traiteur : quhidder vald he declare zou triple traitoris, quha not only knappis Suddrone in zour negative confession, bot also hes causit it to be imprentit in London in contempt of our native language." They fought valiantly, but they fought a losing rearguard action ; native faith and native speech went down together before the twin onslaughts of alien heresy and alien dialect. The

"trahison des clercs" was successful in language and in religion. Henceforward Scottish men of letters, writing in the educated tradition—that is to say those whose works reflect the mind and culture of Europe—belong to the history of English poetry and prose. Lithgow, Grahame, Ancrum, Ayton, Sterling, Drummond, Thomson, Blair, Hume, Mackenzie, Smollet; even such an extremist as Mure of Rowallan whose *True Crucifix for true Catholiques* was a wonderful attempt to bewitch the granite of Calvin's Institutes into Heroic Couplets; all are anglicizers; all are names in the catalogue of English, not of Scots, literature.

The vernacular lived on through the blood and tears of the seventeenth century; its voice is heard under the tramp of armies and the clatter of covenants; there were many poets who employed the lilt, the imagery, the vocabulary, of the Lallan tongue; notably Robert Semphill, Allan Ramsay, the two Hamiltons and Fergusson: their poetry, however, was narrow and limited, confined in outlook, parochial in inspiration. Scotland spoke through their verse, but it was a mutilated Scotland: the content of their poetry was restricted to feelings, emotions, instincts; serious thinking, secular and religious, was carried on in another medium.

The possibilities of true Scots literature have been relegated by the Reformation to the limbo of historical hypotheses; they lie embalmed among the "ifs" of history. Yet how near a thing it was: one has only to turn to the poetry of Dunbar and Henryson, Douglas and Lyndsay, to realize that if achievement was great, promise was still greater. These poets were intensely national; yet competent critics have seen in them a union with the common mind of Europe more intimate than that of Chaucer: beyond all doubt their imaginative grasp of reality possessed a universality not to be found in Gower or Lydgate or Hawes or Skelton. In all four major Scottish poets, even in the renegade Lyndsay, the reader will discover the union of national and super-national which always characterizes great literature informed by the Faith. Even when they are most national, almost parochial, there is a universal European quality in their very Scottishness; this is the goliardic

## Robert Burns : That Immortal Memory 365

strain which vernacular Scots poetry never wholly lost. One of the best examples of this sort of writing is Dunbar's *Testament of Andro Kennedy* :

Nunc condo testamentum meum  
 I leiff my soul for evermare  
 Per Omnipotentum Deum  
 Into my lordis wyne cellar ;  
 Semper ibi ad remanendum,  
 Quhill domisday without dissever.  
 Bonum vinum ad bibendum  
 With sueit Cuthbert that loved me never.  
 A barrell bung ay at my bosom,  
 Of warldis gud I had na mair ;  
 Corpus meum ebriosum  
 I leiff on to the toune of Air.

This is the very form and pressure of the composite figure of Goliath and of the *Credo au Ribaut*, a mood whose impudent irreverencies are everywhere in Burns.

An attempt was made by Lyndsay in *The Tragedy*, in *Monarchie*, and in *Ane pleasant satyre of the thrie Estatis*, and also by the brothers Wedderburn in the *Gude and Godlie Ballatis*, to harness vernacular poetry to the cause of heresy : the blasphemous audacity of some of these *Ballatis*, their naïve, unscrupulous mendacity, would stagger even a modern left-wing journalist. Yet they are extremely amusing : they "swing" the fierce solemn polemics of the heresiarchs as a dance-band leader might "swing" some piece of classical music :

The paip that pagane full of pryde  
 He hes us blindit lang :  
 For quhair the blind the blind dois gyde  
 No wonder baith ga wrang :  
 Lyke prince and kyng he led the Regne  
 Of all iniquitee ;  
 Hay trix, tryme go trix, under the grene wod tre.  
 His Carmelitis and Jacobinis  
 His Dominikis had greit do ;  
 His Cardeleris and Augustinis  
 Sanct Francis ordour to ;  
 Thay sillie Freiris mony zeiris  
 With babling bleirit our ee ;  
 Hay trix, tryme go trix, under the grene wod tre.

If one can stand the irreverences, no funnier reading is to be had.

Scottish vernacular poetry, however, was spared such an unholy coupling to the propaganda train of Protestantism. Attempts to replace universal Catholic supernatural culture by the new Protestant "international" were soon abandoned. Even in England the inspiration of Protestant thought, which flickered uneasily behind Spenser's allegorized pageants, and whose diseased light bleached the rich tapestries of Milton's Renaissance imagination, was soon replaced by the secular international of the *Aufklärung*; by the thought of Descartes, Locke, Bolingbroke, and the French Encyclopedists. Vernacular Scots was abandoned for educative purposes: cultured men thought and argued, rhymed seriously or philosophized in English. "Auld plane Scottis", deprived of Catholic supports, deserted by Protestants, unacknowledged by those whose ideas were drawn from secular culture, sank back into a dim pagan world of instinct, to grope blindly among shadows of emotion and feeling; its only reaction to the upper world, where the Kirk ruled, one of savage revolt. Gaelic poets, such as those described by Mr. Daniel Corkery in *The Hidden Ireland*, experienced a similar isolation, a similar narrowing of the shutter of imagination; they, however, still preserved some memories of the aristocratic tradition of the native courts; they remained in contact with the universal Faith of Christendom: Scottish poetry was disconnected from both traditions.

In the Janus-like genius of Robert Burns this schizophrenia of the Caledonian Muse, of the literary personality of Scotland, finds curious expression. We have seen that the prose or English Burns thought and wrote within the accepted categories of the secular international of his day; the poet Burns was in and of instinctive Scotland. The two are linked by the man's passionate sense of revolt.

GERARD SHANNON, C.M.

(To be continued)



## WILLIAM BLUNDELL, JUNIOR

"THIS honest plain bearer is my son."

Thus wrote William Blundell of Crosby, the Cavalier (1620-1698), in a letter borne by his son William to his friend Richard Langhorne,\* "a learned Councillor-at-Law" in Lincoln's Inn, in the year 1677. That was on the occasion of the younger William's only recorded visit to London apart from the occasion when he was "carried to Newgate" as a prisoner. His parent added a truthful description of him to the above quoted sentence: "a father of many children, and condemned, as his own father before him, to the plough and care".

The younger William's notes and letters find a place here and there in *The Great Hodge Podge* and *The Little Hodge Podge*—the manuscript miscellanies of family documents handed down to his descendants by the Cavalier. They are invariably signed *William Blundell, junior*.

Two volumes† taken from the older man's writings have already been published. While they tell the story of an English citizen during a long period of stress and change in the country, those of his son reflect minutely the home life of the country Squire too much concerned with the difficulties encountered within that narrow circle to find time to make even passing reference to the stormy world outside it.

To begin with he was completely cut off from home and country during the years of his early youth because, as the penal laws prohibited catholic education in England, he had to be educated abroad. In the college maintained for the upbringing of English catholic youth by English Jesuits at St. Omer, he first heard of the determination of his elder brother Nicholas to become a Jesuit, no doubt from his own lips. Nicholas, when writing to solicit his father's sanction to take this step, quoted the family motto: *In omnibus requiem quesivi*.

The Cavalier was too deeply religious a man himself to

\* Blessed Richard Langhorne, the Martyr.

† *A Cavalier's Note Book* (Longman, 1880). *Cavalier: the Letters of William Blundell to his Friends*. Edited by Margaret Blundell (Longman, 1933).

offer any objection, and Nicholas resigned his birthright to his younger brother.

Rest was indeed the last state that a catholic and a royalist might hope to enjoy in even the most remote country seat at that date. The Cavalier had been completely beggared through the sequestration of his estate during the Civil War, and after he had bought it back with borrowed money all his powers of contrivance were required to repay the loan, maintain his immense family, and meet his fines for recusancy. Hence when William junior, his education completed, returned to Crosby as its heir, it was to find himself immediately "condemned, as his own father before him, to the plough and care".

The first thing we learn of William from his own records is that his health suffered severely upon his return to the waterlogged country wherein his home was set. That Lancashire land now so well drained and intensively cultivated was then bogland from which the inhabitants of the surrounding countryside cut turf for their fuel. The men of the Blundell family are constantly found suffering from "a quartan ague"—or malaria.

In August 1666 William, answering a letter from Nicholas written at Liège the previous January, says :

You desired to know how my health was. I am now, God be praised, well, and I hope freed from my former distemper, but yet of bodily forces weak, which how long it must continue so, I leave all to God. I thank you for your prayers for my health, and now, having obtained that, I hope you will assist me by begging grace of God that I may spend my time aright.

To mitigate their financial difficulties it was imperative that the succeeding Squires of Crosby should hold only a life interest in their property, and the Cavalier, having entailed it upon his second son, now applied himself to the search for a wife for his heir who would bring some money to the partnership. This quest proved a costly business, young catholic ladies with any considerable dowry being extremely few and far between. William senior had, however, suffered a bitter lesson on the ills of an improvident marriage through the love match of his own daughter Emelia with Richard Butler, Lord Mountgarret's

eldest son, after that young gentleman had been disowned by his father for his defiance in the matter; he was consequently determined to take no risks in the more important affair of the "matching" of William junior. The young man was left at home to attend to the farm upon the fruits of which the large family lived, while his father made the preliminary investigations and even paid the first addresses to the daughters of catholic houses here and there in his behalf.

Finally, after the respective fathers had evidently come to terms on the matter of settlements, William junior was allowed to pay his addresses in person to Mary Eyre, daughter of Roland Eyre of Hassop, in Derbyshire. A priest friend of both families "found" this bride for him. A love-letter addressed to her on the wooer's return to Crosby awakens a suspicion that it was dictated by his resolute father. For the copy\* of it is to be found among the Cavalier's own letters and is not included among those of William junior.

Young William and Mary Blundell set out on their uneventful married life with the courage of man and wife who are indifferent to wealth, looking to their fields for their family's sustenance. They had fourteen children and only six of them died—a negligible percentage for that day. Mary's confinements were often preceded by "convulsive fitts"; according to her father-in-law's testimony she was "a good young wif", so we may be sure she obediently drank the remedies of the day, compounded from various herbs steeped in sack; she must have worn a heart-shaped packet of sliced peony roots reposing upon her stomach, but all was vain until a secret prescription was imparted to the Cavalier by a friend.

Possibly Mary, having dutifully imbibed three doses of the decoction before the full moon and three at its waning, may have been cured of her malady by shock upon learning that, among more loathsome ingredients comprising her medicine, was a human skull.

Although this happy marriage was an arranged one it led to close and affectionate relations between the two families.

On 14 March, 1669, William, writing to his sister-in-law,

\* Cavalier.

adds to his description of his baby son and heir guarded information of the whereabouts of his priest brother-in-law.

To my sister Elizabeth Eyre at Hassop. March 14th 1669

. . . Little Nick is a jolly, fat lad. He was here upon Sunday, but has not teeth. As I was about to write this I received a letter out of Northumberland from a kinsman of mine, who tells me that our brother William Eyre is to be his neighbour and to live with one Mr. Collingwood at Eslington. When I hear more of this you shall know it.

Before he was quite overwhelmed by care owing to the number of his children and the narrowness of his purse, poor William found time to disport himself occasionally with his neighbours. In a letter quoted in *A Cavalier's Note Book* he writes :

. . . If you could have time to make a step over to Lancashire, I would show you once a week a meeting of a dozen or fourteen gentlemen or perhaps more, who after a dinner at Sefton, spend the afternoon merrily at bowls. My Lord Molyneux and his son (who is lately come out of Italy), Sir Edward Stanley and my cousin Lea and others have engaged to meet at Sefton every week. Besides this Sir Edward Stanley has set afoot bows and arrows and follows that sport very eagerly . . . So that now if you, or any of your good friends, will do us the favour to see us you shall find some other diversion besides downright drinking.

Early letters of William junior reveal the happy relations existing between himself, his wife and a former maid who had written to ask him to be responsible for her money during her absence from England. The first was written in 1670.

To Mistress Alice Clarke at London.

Good Alice,

Yours of the 22nd received, and it was very welcome to me for truly I had a very great desire to hear from you before you left England . . . Yours to my wife found her in childbed of her second son which lived but three hours . . . She is now very well recovered and very hearty, though her new maid (Bess Formby whom she hath parted with again) as you may well conceive gave her occasion of trouble now and then. She has now got another more to her content, but still poor Alice Clarke is wanting and, without flattery, ever will be . . .

Little Nick is very well.

And now, as touching your business of the bonds you mentioned unto me for £100 due unto you from my Father Eyre, they shall be carefully kept by me when they come into my hands, and likewise the use money for the said sum of £100, but I must know how you would have the use money disposed of, for in yours to me you only desire that I should receive the *use of all*. I hope it will not disoblige my Father Eyre that you should appoint me to receive your monies from him. If you find that it do I must beg of you that you will please to name it, and employ some other body therein. But if you find it may be done without giving offence, I will perform it with all the diligence and sincerity I can. If this arrive before you leave the town, I pray let me hear from you and instruct me how I may direct a letter to you when you have crossed the sea, for I believe I shall have occasion to write to you about your own business. Our Derbyshire friends acquainted us with your intention to travel. I wish from my soul that your hopes may not be frustrated and that all things may succeed as fortunately as you desire.

I pray present my faithful love and service to my niece Anne Eyre, and when you meet together, take some time to remember

Your loving friend,

W. Blundell junior.

Evidently Good Alice diplomatically steered clear of giving offence to Mr. Eyre and triumphantly left her small business affairs in the hands of his son-in-law. For there are other letters dealing with this matter directed to Mistress Alice Clarke at divers addresses. Now she is at Paris but "this letter is sent to Mr. Tho. Massey at the 'Golden Buck'".

Father Thomas Massey, S.J., while busy with the affairs of his Province in London, was in touch with travellers going backwards and forwards to the continent and able to find a "trusty hand" by which letters could be carried to seminary or cloister grille.

Another letter is sent by William's cousin Anne Blundell, on her way to her convent school in France :

"You must bring her acquainted with my niece Anne Eyre. I think they will be a pair of fine young ladies, though at present Nanny Blundell must fall much short of the other."

After reporting on his own and his father's fits of ague,

and dealing with her own business, he good-naturedly gives her an account of her late fellow servants.

"Your friend Betty Naylor went from Crosby at midsummer, and Ralph Lowe left my service in Lent, since when they are said to be married, but I do not believe it. There have been no other considerable changes among us."

In December 1671 Good Alice is discovered in Lincoln. It may perhaps be conjectured that she is employed in collecting and escorting novices to a convent abroad, an affair that had to be carried out in strictest secrecy in face of the penal laws.

"I wish with all my heart that your business may succeed to your own satisfaction and expectation," writes William, "for it hath caused you to take in hand a great journey. If in order to your business you will be forced to go to Ireland (which may very well happen) I think your best course will be to come to Crosby and then you know who will be glad to see you."

The letters are signed, "Your affectionate true friend," or "Your truly loving friend, William Blundell junior."

During the early years of their marriage, William and Mary Blundell lived with the family at Crosby.

"My wife and I are still tablers with my father," wrote William junior to Alice Clarke in 1671. And we have the Cavalier's testimony that it was a happy arrangement: "We live in peace, I thank God for it, in as much peace as can be," writes the older man.

In 1673 the bulk of the estate seems to have been made over to the management of William junior, and in 1676 his father and mother with Brigid, the only one of their ten living children remaining at home, became "tablers" with the younger couple.

In 1682 William junior makes a modest claim from his uncle Sir Thomas Haggerston\* for the entertainment of his son "with horses and servants" (the number of either is not stated) for four and a half months:

"... I shall not be unjust if I say it is my opinion I shall not be a gainer by his coming if you pay me twenty pound, yet I shall most freely discharge you of the debt

\* Of Haggerston, Northumberland.



if you pay eighteen pounds." He requests that the debt be paid through "Mr. Peter Beaugrand at London . . . You may hear of the said Beaugrand at Mr. Littleboy's house, a saddler at the 'Black Horse' in Grace's Street."

This year found poor William junior already overwhelmed by the family cares which were to burden him so heavily for the rest of his life. He wrote to his sisters Alice and Mary Blundell who were Poor Clare nuns at Gravelines, giving a graphic account of the family at Crosby:

. . . To begin with our parents, I can only say my father was never in better health than at present. My mother is full of rhumes and pains, otherwise pretty hearty; as for myself, I have a busy caring life as all those must have, who have many children and a numerous family . . . and my poor wife is very unhealthful which is a great grief unto me. For God's sake pray that I may cheerfully embrace the crosses which He sends in this life and then I shall be happy. And love still your dearly loving brother

W. B. junior.

Poor William's difficulties obliged him to borrow money here and there at about this time. On 29 July, 1683, he gave to one Edward Clayton a bond for £300 as security for a loan of £140 to himself and his father, on which they paid £7 19s. 8d. annually in interest. His occupations and preoccupations are reflected in the accounts which he had to give of his father's money while the Cavalier was in London, whither he betook himself with many a Catholic contemporary, on the accession of King James II.

The sale of turf for fuel formed an important item in the income of the estate.

Jan. 27th, 1685. Received from Rich. Harrison

which he had received for new turves . . .	£15	0	0
Other entries are: for more new turves sold . . .	8	0	0
For old turves sold . . . . .	1	15	0

Father and son now took advantage of the repeal of the penal laws, among others that prohibiting a Catholic from possessing a horse worth more than £5. William junior triumphantly sold "a black stoned horse" to Sir James Pool for £17 and records that he bought a young black horse at Anderton fair for £15 12s. 6d. Letters and accounts become deeply involved in matters pertaining

to the stable. Each visit of "Henry farrier" cost 2*s.* while 1*s.* 3*d.* was paid for the "sugar and white wine vinegar" which he prescribed for his patient, Ranter. The shoeing of a horse cost 1*s.* 4*d.*; "for mouthing six young horses and pacing two", £2 8*s.* 0*d.* was paid. When these prices are compared with those of wages it will be seen that the upkeep of the stable, wherein lay the only means of travel, was costly. A labourer was paid fourpence per day, a butler £2 per annum.

The prices realized by the farm produce and beasts sold by William junior for the absent William senior are duly set forth in the accounts :

On the 24th of May 86 Richard Harrison sent an account to my father of corn sold for which he had received £10 14*s.* 3½*d.*, and for six score bushels of barley delivered to Bailey Travers for which at midsummer he is to pay £11 10*s.*; for eighteen beasts sold for £57 8*s.* 9*d.* Cattle unsold 8 bred at Crosby, two years old, two that were at hire, and out at hire one bull.

Oxen were used for the plough, for which purpose the team was evidently "at hire".

The accounts were complicated by the "boon work" by means of which the tenants paid part of their rent in labour. When William junior made use of this labour for the land he was farming himself he paid its value in money to Richard Harrison, his father's bailiff.

Jan. 1st, 1687. I had paid Richard Harrison 5*s.* 2*d.* for so many days work that were done by the tenants' carts for me.

	£	s.	d.
He accounts to have received in all for cart boon .	3	13	6
I likewise paid him for 29 days shearing done for me by the tenants . . . . .		9	8
They did the rest of their shearing boon for you.			
I paid him likewise for 12 days of cartage boon		3	0
For rent hens in all 115 . . . . .	2	17	6
All shearing and cartage is done, but some are yet behind with their house rent, cart boons and hens.			

The Cavalier, as we know from his letters, was at this time busying himself in London in an effort to obtain a post in the civil service with the object of helping his son financially. In the document\* entitled "The Family

\* *A Cavalier's Note Book.*

of William Blundell" which he sought to have presented to the King, he writes :

There are living this present year 1687-8 no fewer than 15 sons and daughters (besides the teeming wife of his most dutiful eldest son, and some children already preferred) that are yet to be provided for out of his small estate : and this estate is at present so sorely charged, that although the family hath long subsisted in the worst times, it is now in danger to fail when times are good. . . .

Poor William Blundell hoped in vain that the bad times for Catholics were to end during the reign of a Catholic King. His petition was never presented, for James's throne was already rocking under the attacks of his enemies.

Nicholas Blundell, the Jesuit, was already dead. The fifteen sons and daughters of the house, alluded to as being provided for out of the Crosby estate at that date, included William senior and William junior, Frances Blundell the Cavalier's sister, Brigid his unmarried daughter, Thomas his third son who had also become a Jesuit, his daughters Jane, Margaret, Alice, Mary and Clare Frances, all nuns in France, and William junior's five surviving children. He had buried six, one of whom had survived infancy, and three more were to be added to his family in the three years following the date at which the petition was drawn up. The latecomers all lived, Joseph Thomas to become a Jesuit, Winifride and Frances to enter the English Benedictine convent at Ghent.

The Cavalier had good reason to write thirteen years later, when complaining of the double taxation levied upon all non-Jurors : "As for my own single person, I could indifferently be able to bear it, but my son being charged with a numerous brood of children both at home and abroad, I shall have very much ado to preserve him from sinking. Perhaps," he adds with the whimsical touch that appears in his letters to the end, "you will be apt to think (and I do not deny it) that the greatest burden which lies on the son's shoulders is the long life of the father. Why truly for my life I cannot help it, although I do sundry ways endeavour to make him able to support it."

Poor harassed William junior betrays his financial anxieties, and quaintly reveals his own personality, in another letter of the year 1687, relating to the sums to be adjusted with his father.

I hope I shall give you a just account of all [he says]. It is my intention to do so and not to wrong you of a penny and I am well satisfied you are so charitable as to believe it, notwithstanding when monies have been very low with me I have sometimes been tempted to make use of some of yours to supply my present wants, but by God's assistance I will account to you for the utmost farthing . . . It is no great trouble to me, being a thing that I take content in. I must acknowledge that the 15*s.* which I mentioned in my letter of the 26th of March should have been fifteen pounds, for so I find it in my own book, and it was a sore mistake in me to call it no more but fifteen shillings . . .

The Cavalier's parental attitude remains the same when his son is sustaining the cares of family and estate as it had been when he was a schoolboy.

A letter of March 1687, from the younger William to the elder, introduces us to the next generation in the person of Nicholas Blundell,\* whose pen was destined to draw a picture of country life in his own times as vividly as his predecessors had depicted it in theirs. He was then at the Jesuit school of St. Omer.

Sir

Rich Harrison has yours of the 16th which brought me a later letter from Nicholas. The character is ill enough to be his own, but the latin is somewhat too good I fear and yet it is not without its faults, however I like it well . . .

The years came and went, the boys and girls grew up in their schools on foreign soil, and William junior plodded on.

"Your Uncle," wrote the Cavalier to his grandson Richard Butler in 1691, "labours and toils apace to keep us all alive ; he rises as soon as the sun."

The same hand bears witness to the continuance of the happy family relations : "I must tell you that although, through our double paying of taxes and our numerous broods here, our straits at the present are very great, we are not yet come into any distress."

\* Author of *Blundell's Diary*.

The family's anxiety must have been acute when the old Cavalier was imprisoned for eight months in Manchester in 1689, under the supposition that he was a Jacobite although no definite charge was brought against him.

During a decade no letters from the pen of William junior found a place among the pages of *The Great* or *The Little Hodge Podge*, but here and there a stray document affords a glimpse into his activities, as when he arbitrates in a countryman's dispute about a bill :

Inter William Starkie and Ralph Starkie. The quarrels and controversies depending between the parties above-named seriously considered by William Blundell the younger of Little Crosby, Gentleman, and Richard Tickle of Ince Blundell, Yeoman, to whom all things are referred in point of reconciliation.

Therefore with due deliberation the said William Blundell and R. Tickle, upon hearing of the several proofs (which upon occasion would be made use of in law), and allowing the same, do order that the said W. Starkie do pay 20s. unto the said Ralph in consideration of a bill for 48s. 6d. which he, the said Ralph had expended in repairing the housing of the said W. Starkie. And if there be any materials which are not yet made use of in the repair of the said building, and are included in the said bill of 48s. 6d., those materials shall be esteemed to be, and are, the property of the said W. Starkie. And the said Ralph shall not at any time during the natural lives of the said W. Starkie or of Jane his wife, lay any claim unto any of the goods or housing belonging to the said W. Starkie. And the said W. Starkie shall by will or otherwise before his death settle his said house with the appurtenances upon the said Ralph during his term therein, after the decease of the said William and Jane.

Thus, in that simpler day, was recourse to litigation avoided.

Many impoverished and dispossessed Irish gentlefolk sought relief among Catholics in England towards the end of the seventeenth century. William junior kept a copy of his recommendation of one such lady to the charity of his neighbours.

Crosby.

March 13th, 1693-4

This is to certify our good friends unto whom this may chance to come, that the bearer, Mrs. Margaret Doylan, has been entertained here for the space of six or seven days where she has given

us much satisfaction by an humble and modest deportment, by which and by what we have otherwise heard of her, we take her to be an extraordinary object of charity. She has given us an agreeable divertisement by her skill on the Irish harp, and we think that it is happy for her that what she learned for her pleasure when she was a maid in her father's house, should now in her wants and widowhood, be a means in some measure to gain her bread.

The last and heaviest trial sustained by William senior and William junior has been fully described in *Cavalier*. Both were involved in the famous Trial of the Lancashire Gentlemen at Manchester in 1694. All were acquitted, but not before poor William junior had endured three months' imprisonment in Newgate Gaol in place of his father, who was too infirm for the journey.

The Cavalier lived another four years, during which the pressure of "the everlasting and double taxes", as he described them, pressed ever more heavily on his family and estate.

"Our condition here is very low and hard," he wrote to his daughter Margaret, a nun in France, "and especially in regard to your brother whose manifold charges are very hard to be borne."

William senior died in 1698, and his son only survived him by four years. After his life of toil, anxiety and filial subjection, William junior was not long his own master; it is surprising to find that he was able to hand on the Crosby Estate in a flourishing condition to his son Nicholas.

The "content" which William junior took in figures led to the development of a vein of enterprise in him late in life. His son's correspondence after his death reveals that he hazarded some of his hard-won farm profits in trade with the coastal towns of the New World. Perhaps it was partly owing to the success of this venture, coupled with the rise in the value of land, that he was able to leave his heir, according to Nicholas's own testimony, "in very good circumstances".

MARGARET BLUNDELL.



## SOME RECENT BOOKS

*History of the Dogma of the Trinity.* Vol. I. By Jules Lebreton, S.J. Translated by Algar Thorold. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 15s.)

IN the thirty years which have elapsed since the publication of this book in the original its influence has been so great that its importance might easily be overlooked by readers of the present volume. The conclusions, historical and exegetical, to which it comes, and its refutations of modern critics (especially, perhaps, of Bousset) have become so much a part of the intellectual equipment of Catholic thinkers that it might not be recognized for what it is: a genuine source, a work of lasting value. It is a pity that we have had to wait so long for a translation into English, but this does not make its appearance the less welcome, and the publishers deserve our most sincere thanks. This was presumably one of the last labours of Algar Thorold's life; it was clearly a labour of love.

The value of translations from the French in such a field is sometimes questioned. It is argued that the specialist does not need them and that the layman cannot manage them. Whatever may be the truth about the specialist, the layman most happily is reading theology and philosophy to what appears a steadily increasing extent, and this volume is admirably suited to introduce him to a fare more solid perhaps than his wont but correspondingly rewarding. He will therefore be kept in mind in the following description. This is a work of erudition by a writer who is so fully in control of his material that the reader is led to accept his conclusions without a laborious and technical examination of evidence, but yet with a sufficient understanding of the issues. This result is enhanced by the shortening of the footnotes. The description of religion in the ancient world with which the volume opens is not only a pleasure to the classical scholar; it is of quite general interest (it is easier, surely, to be interested in people's religion than in, say, the details of their constitutional history). Take, for example, the summary of Stoicism: "No ancient doctrine had placed so high a value upon human personality; but equally none had so insanely exalted the pride of man." (p. 33.) It must be allowed that the latter half of the first book is not easy reading. Chrysippus and Plutarch, Varro and Heraclitus jostle one another in a way which the general reader will find bewildering; even the classical scholar might be in danger of a momentary telescoping of the centuries. But that does not matter much. However vague our grasp of details, we carry away a picture of an amazing mental turmoil, a startling contrast

with the firm lines of Christian thought to which we shall be introduced, a seed-ground which could not of itself bear such a harvest.

In the second book ("The Jewish Preparation") the same remarks apply to the analysis of Philo. It is heavy going, but we do not take long to see that he is as far from "explaining" the Christian doctrine of the Logos as was Plutarch in the preceding book. Philo is interesting to the Thomist; Lebreton has summed up his mind once for all: "Inquisitive rather than powerful" (p. 161). Again enlightenment comes in exciting flashes: "When the Jews could no longer say: Spirit of Jahve, they said: Spirit of Holiness, or Holy Spirit" (p. 116).

The clearing of the atmosphere when we reach the third and last book of this volume ("The Christian Revelation") cannot fail to make a deep impression. The manner as well as the matter is responsible for this. Lebreton's sketch of the Synoptic Gospels from the point of view of his inquiry provides reading for which alone it is well worth acquiring this book. Here the general description already given is true without reserve. A few illustrations must suffice. "Those who find the gospel obscure and cannot see there the divine features of the Lord, should first read again the Sermon on the Mount" (p. 207). "His work of evangelization became daily less extended, but deeper" (p. 243). "*Kurios Kaisar*, *Kurios Iesous*, are two formulas apparently identical, to which superficial historians may give the same value; in reality they have nothing in common but the words" (p. 279). "To the question put so clearly and authoritatively: 'Art thou the Christ, the Son of God?' Jesus replied unequivocally: 'I am.' He thus pronounced his own sentence of death, and at the same time gave his own supreme testimony" (p. 250). But the book must be read for these passages to have their full significance; in their contexts they are stages in a triumphant argument. The reader will be encouraged to embark on the long chapters on St. Paul and St. John. A striking comparison will soon fire the imagination: "Supposing we had nothing of St. John's but his epistles, we should have no idea of his evangelical catechesis, any more than we can learn from the *Epistles of St. Peter* the details given us in the *Gospel of St. Mark*" (p. 290); and it is to be hoped that many will face a certain inevitable complexity in the concluding chapters for the sake of the store of knowledge which they contain, "knowledge" in that full Johannine sense which is here so admirably shown. The reader of this first volume must not expect to find in it the developed Trinitarian theology; we find the Divine Persons in the New Testament; their unity in the Divine Nature has yet to be explained.

The translation begins so excellently that it is not until a reference to Euripides appears on p. 23 (*Troyen*), that a French original becomes apparent. Only a few obscurities will be found, and only one passage calls for comment: p. 301 (repeated on p. 338) gives "in him" instead of "for him" as the translation of *eis autrón* in Colossians i, 16 (the French has *pour lui*). It is surprising that the appendix on liturgical formulas (p. 439) does not mention the interpretation of "in the name of Jesus" according to which "name" is the equivalent of "power".

DOM ILLTYD TRETHOWAN.

*A Companion to the Summa.* Volume II. The Pursuit of Happiness. By Walter Farrell, O.P. (Sheed & Ward. 10s. 6d. net.)

FATHER FARRELL has achieved an unique book on the *Summa*. It is not a translation; it is not a professor's commentary. It is Aquinas right enough, but served up in such a manner that he has become as readable as a novelist. To the intelligent layman it will be a revelation of what a fascinating science theology can be made. To the theological student it will be what the author says it is: a Companion to the *Summa*. While he is perusing the small type in double column on poor paper in his cheap edition of the *Summa*, the student will turn constantly to this genial companion which clothes Aquinas in modern English, is forceful and eloquent, and abounds in apt illustrations drawn from familiar things and scenes and episodes of daily life.

This volume—evidently there are more to come, *Deo gratias!*—comprises the first part of the second part of the *Summa Theologica*. It follows the questions in the original in exact order. But the author has grouped a number of questions together into chapters; and the chapter headings, as also the title of the book, are all his own. The subject matter of this part is Human Acts. Human acts are the tools by which man carves out happiness for himself: therefore the title of the book becomes The Pursuit of Happiness. And in it happiness is pursued *per longum et latum*; its essence is defined, the means to it described, the tools detailed. Passions, emotions, instincts, habits—good and bad: these are the intrinsic principles of human actions. Extrinsic principles are law, by which man is instructed, and grace, by which he is helped. All these get full measure of treatment. At the end of the book Father Farrell has added a chapter entirely his own, which has nothing to do with the *Summa*: An Analysis of Modern Ethical Opinion. We can be grateful for it: after struggling through its jungle of conflicting and chaotic opinions we come back to the sunlight of Aquinas with relief.

But let it not be concluded that Father Farrell has left modern thought alone until that last chapter, and that he has been expounding the *Summa* without applying it to modern conditions. On the contrary, chapter by chapter he has been analysing contemporary thought and showing that the timeless principles of Aquinas can solve the problems of our age. If St. Thomas knew his age, Father Farrell knows his, and thereby proves himself a worthy disciple of his Master.

Here are a few examples. Modern man, says our author, is desperately unhappy and his doctors do not know where to look for the root of the trouble, nor will they discover it until they give up the attempt to prove that men and women are not human. Of course; for unhappiness has to do with the intellect, the will, the soul of man. Quite simply, the root's name is *sin*.

Our world has laughed Heaven and Hell and Sin to scorn. Yet frequently among the neo-pagans we find a scrupulous avoidance of lesser sin. Petty theft, lying, rudeness, idle gossip, wasting of time are all looked on with real horror; even though side by side with this horror is an indifference to contraception, divorce, large-scale theft, unlimited greed, irreligion, and so on. In other words, they seem to have disregarded the essentials of human life while clinging desperately to the things that make for its adornment.

Father Farrell says we are not an age in love with beauty. You can hear our novel-reading generation cry in amazement: Not in love with beauty? No, says our author, because we are not in love with reality. Not in love with reality, when our novelists pride themselves on being realists above everything else? To which the relentless Dominican replies: Only with that superficial, partial reality that falls under the senses. They have chained man down to the sense world, and so have made his taste for the beautiful a taste that destroys the object it feeds on.

Perhaps these examples will suffice to show the quality of this book.

C. E. E.

*The Love of God.* By Dom Aelred Graham. (Longmans, Green. 7s. 6d. net.)

THIS is a work of philosophy rather than of mysticism or devotion. It considers the love of God as an affair of the intellect more than of the heart: it is the analysis of divine charity poured into a crucible and held up to the pure light of reason and revelation. It is not a book of mysticism in the Carmelite sense, in which the soul's progress in prayer would be traced and illustrated by the

mystical experiences of St. Teresa and St. John. Nor is it a book of devotion like those of the Franciscan school, with all their human warmth and poetry of life. Dom Graham's approach to God is unmistakably along Dominican lines, using St. Thomas for his inspiration and support the whole way. Yet it is an original monograph, not in the sense that it adds anything new to Catholic philosophy but that it interprets the teaching of the greatest of the schoolmen for the benefit of those who will not read the *Summa* for themselves and who cannot fit his teaching to the problems of modern life. This is just where Dom Graham becomes the guide. But his object is to interpret rather than to teach. He passes from the *Summa* to the affairs of modern life in regard to divine charity, as an interpreter passes between two speakers who cannot understand each other. If at times his thought flies high up into the realms of metaphysics, it very soon comes down again to the practical, and never passes through the clouds: so that while you watch his quick ascents and descents from the abstruse to the concrete, and back again into the abstruse, you never lose sight of him.

The treatise is divided into four parts: the nature of love, its conditions, its expression, and its effects. We must start with a clear conception of God as the one who is loved, for we cannot love Him unless we first know Him. Then man himself is considered, as the one who loves, in relation to the Beloved for whom he possesses an inherent longing. And thirdly the reciprocal love which passes between man and God is examined and defined. In part two we pass to the conditions on which the achievement of divine love depends: grace and unworldliness. The third part treats of prayer, self-denial and action, as the expression of love; and in the fourth part the soul experiences the effects of charity in contemplation and union with God. Reviewed in perspective, the work may be considered as an intellectual approach to God in the way of charity, with the Loved One considered as present, as it were, at the end of a long avenue of thought through which the soul must pass before attaining union with Him. The soul is well equipped for her journey and carefully guided towards the object of her love. The book should be most useful, as it does impress upon the reader the one thing that matters before all else. When will we really realize that Christianity is positively a religion of love, a religion in which the Creator is linked to the creature in a bond of reciprocal charity? The idea of serving God for fear or for gain, though good in itself, does not, however, appeal to chivalrous souls: in the last resort it will always be love that surpasses all other motives.

D. A. L.

*Religions of Unbelief.* By André Bremond, S.J. (Bruce, Milwaukee; Coldwell, London. \$1.75.)

MODERN rationalists congratulate themselves that the findings of science have out-moded supernatural religion. Recent discoveries and theories in physics do not supply any scientific proof of the existence of God; therefore unbelief is the only rational attitude for modern scientific man. Yet more and more do men cry out: "Give us God." A god of some sort man must have; a religion which shall be the service of that god; a belief and an ethic that shall give some meaning to life and some moral purpose. So the rationalists have themselves been driven to invent a god. Of course it must be a god conformable to reason; to our limited, human reason, that reason "that wants to explain everything, to reduce everything to rational necessity, to facts entirely explicable, to demonstrable propositions: reason, the enemy of all mystery and of all liberty, whose workings cannot be accurately foretold, even though that liberty be the Divine Liberty". That, of course, makes rationalism itself a religion; and it claims to justify itself as such because it preserves the moral values and the uplifting power which are commonly associated with religion.

Rationalism begins the process by making a huge assumption: that man once had a perfect religion of rationalism in Hellenism, which was a philosophy of life that gave birth to the highest manifestations of human genius. If, therefore, Hellenism can be shown to be anti-supernatural, the rationalists would seem to have a good foundation. But can it? Father Bremond says: No; all the evidence points rather to a deep sense of the limits and shortcomings of human reason and man's dependence on some supernatural power and goodness. In the first and longest, and to many readers the best, chapter of this book he draws out the evidence in a manner that is fascinating.

Spinoza next is examined, as a man who tried to make rationalism a religion and an ideal of life. Did he succeed? Father Bremond is very fair, and freely admits the fascination there is about Spinoza, and how captivating his work which gives the impression of a God-inebriated soul. But examined in cold reason he proves to be drunk with words: words whose only virtue is despair, because all we can know of God is that God knows nothing of us and cares less, and His highest attribute is indifference. Can you worship Divine Indifference?

Then come two instances of modern God-makers: Bertrand Russell and H. G. Wells, selected because representative. Mr. Russell sees the world as utterly purposeless and devoid of reason; a bad joke; an absurdity. Into such a world man is born with



his sense of right and wrong, with ideals, with the power to judge the absurd whole of which he is a part. Still, he means to live, and since religion is a vital need he makes his own god: "the god created by our own love of the good." What shall be his attitude to the mad, bad world—defy it? No; for that would still be bondage to it. Transform it, rather; refashion it by the power of mind, and so gain a victory over it, and make of it a triumphant tragedy. Mr. Wells also sees the need of religion; sees our time as one of exceptional religious need. The god he gives us is his "Invisible King": an elder brother born of our own wills. Father Bremond suggests that he is a son born of the philosopher's mind, made in the likeness of his father, having the Wellsian attitude to the waste, absurdities, cruelties of life; and he honestly does his best not to guffaw at this farcical god.

The rest of the book is a straightforward essay in apologetics, to show that the intensity of our moral life anticipates a divine message and disposes the soul to welcome it. To make the essay come alive he makes good use of two excellent modern books, *The Faith of a Moralist*, by A. W. Taylor, and *The Meaning of God in Human Experience*, by W. E. Hocking.

This book is profoundly interesting, and very easy to read; so much so that it is hard to realize that it is a translation and not written originally in English. The author made the translation himself, assisted, he tells us, by friends. He certainly deserves congratulations on the result.

C. E. E.

*Cosmologia In Usum Scholarum.* Auctore Gerardo Esser, S.V.D.  
(Typis Domus Missionum ad St. Mariam, Techny, Ill.,  
U.S.A. n.p.)

WHATEVER the technical distinction, it is impracticable in the domain of cosmology to keep philosophy separate from science. In theory one might compose a slender volume of cosmology confined to the results of reflection upon the intrinsic nature of physical being, organic and inorganic, as known in ordinary experience, prescinding from the information about them derived from the natural sciences. But it would be of little worth. In this volume, therefore, scientific and strictly philosophical discussion proceed side by side. If the philosophic doctrine of hylomorphism, which is incapable of scientific proof or disproof, is discussed, so also is the constitution of inorganic matter as investigated by modern physics and the findings of biology concerning organic life and heredity, and the scientific hypothesis of organic evolution. Those who imagine that scholas-

tic philosophy belongs to an antiquated mediaeval world of scientific ignorance would have their eyes opened could they (though unfortunately most of these people have discarded Latin as also out of date) follow the treatment by Dr. Esser of the constitution of the atom, relativity, general and special, or the factors which have influenced the evolution of species. Oh yes; the modern schoolman can accept the evolution of species as readily as his mediaeval ancestors accepted what they regarded as the assured results of Greek science. It is true Dr. Esser does not universalize it. At the origin of the great lines of organic development he postulates a special action of God. Let not the critic be too eager to cry "Tennessee!"—for he will find that Dr. Esser explicitly denies that this action was an act of creation: it was a modification, of what nature we cannot exactly determine, of what already existed. Our only criticism is that in our view every advance in being requires an action of God, other than His ordinary concomitance, to produce it, for the effect cannot exceed its causes. Take, for example, animal generation. The adult offspring obviously contains far more being than the fertilized cell from which it sprang. Whence comes it? From the action of God, we hold, imparting to that cell, or rather, perhaps, to a collection of cells at a later stage of development, the form of the new animal. What essential difference is there between such action and the action imparting the new form of animal life to what before had been merely vegetative life? Like the growth of the embryo, specific mutations, great or small, and even such a change as first produced inorganic being, are, in our view, the phenomenal exterior of a hidden divine action.

That is to say, we cannot accept the ordinary scholastic belief, enunciated elsewhere by Dr. Esser, that the new form is educed by natural agencies from the potentiality of its matter, for the form is more than that potentiality plus the action of the agents. We believe that the agents produce such a disposition of the matter that in virtue of the Divine Will there supervenes from the divine source of forms, the Creative Word, the new form.

We are glad to observe that Dr. Esser does not commit himself to the strict Thomist view of the unity of substantial form, but leaves open as a possible the other scholastic view, that a higher form may subsume lower forms incorporating into the new substance complete substances as its parts. If this is so, we can believe that the atom, itself composed of prime matter and form, enters as such into the molecule, itself constituted by a higher substantial form. What is not clear is how, if this is true, the matter of the higher, the molecular form, can be *materia prima*. We should regard it as a *materia secunda*. It does not seem to

us that Dr. Esser has made this point very plain. But in general his discussion of the various ways in which scholastics apply hylomorphism to the results of modern physics is most illuminating. There is a commendably concise account of relativity which bears such an appearance of clarity that we are convinced that it must be a congenital incapacity to grasp it which makes us unable to follow the exposition. But in any case Dr. Esser does not think relativity is proved.

Those who suppose theologians to be on the alert to make science proclaim theological dogmas might notice that Dr. Esser rejects as decisively as Lord Russell the attempt to make the alleged indeterminacy of the subatomic support free-will. He shows that the fact that our means of observation cannot establish a causal law is no proof that it does not exist. Nor does Dr. Esser think that the present inclination of astronomy to declare the universe finite in time and space does more than establish a probability. Finitude in time he regards as *certainly* known by revelation alone, the normal Thomist view; infinity in space he regards as not impossible philosophically. Here, however, we cannot agree, for we think there can be no actual infinity outside God. We depart from Dr. Esser and, we admit, from the ordinary scholastic view, by denying continuous extension and holding a dynamic view of matter. We believe extension can be analysed into units of energy, the extension arising from their number and arrangement. Each of these is constituted by a potential energy, its matter, actualized by its form.

In thus indicating our own point of view we do not mean to cavil at Dr. Esser's excellent statement of the normal scholastic doctrines, which in any case are better suited for a textbook than purely individual speculations. He has done his work very well and laid down a good foundation of scholastic and modern scientific cosmology which we should do well to assimilate, even if, on certain points, we might hereafter take a more personal line of thought.

E. I. W.

*The Philosophy of Physical Science.* By Sir Arthur Eddington.  
(Cambridge University Press. 8s. 6d. net.)

DR. EDDINGTON is here concerned to correct what he considers to be an inconsistency on the part of physicists who do not discern between the objective and the subjective in their work; he also regrets the unwillingness of scientists to enter the realm of philosophy. In order to regularize the situation the author develops an outline of a general philosophical outlook which a scientist can accept without inconsistency.

The correlation of the efforts of scientists and philosophers would indeed be an advantage welcome to all concerned, and Dr. Eddington has certainly made the issue more definite. All types of human knowledge involve certain common principles, both in regard to the activities of the student and the fabric of the world which is the object of study, however different may be the methods and instruments proper to each department of investigation. But what actually are the common and special factors is by no means agreed upon at present.

The general uncertainty about knowledge which followed in the wake of the Reformation led, through the loss of the natural realism of Aristotle, to widespread scepticism. An escape from this was first sought in Idealism, which repudiated the very existence of an objective world, and so restored consistency by asserting the unity of the mental world. Against this Kant sought to show that it was not necessary to deny the existence of the world so long as we were content to treat knowledge of it as mainly the product of our subjective reaction assuming the patterns latent in our sensibility and understanding. Dr. Eddington favours the Kantian method, and just as Kant based his scheme on an alleged proof of the subjectivity of space and time, so Dr. Eddington offers a subjectivist theory of space and time which he considers to be implicit in the outlook of all who accept the Relativity Theory and the Quantum Theory.

The background of Idealism still survives in the majority of modern philosophies, including those which are classed as realist, for the starting point is subjective, namely, our states of consciousness. If, therefore, there is any antecedent limitation in Dr. Eddington's theory it is one which he shares with the realists to whom he appeals as unsympathetic towards philosophic scientists. He evidently takes it for granted that as a philosopher he must accept the dogma that there can be no data for the student other than modes of human consciousness, there being no immediate access to the objective world, with the consequence that the conclusions of science are likewise merely subjective interpretations: "We reach then the position of idealist, as opposed to materialist, philosophy. The purely objective world is the spiritual world; and the material world is subjective in the sense of selective subjectivism." Whether scientists in general can be induced to adopt this view of their data is more than questionable, and their reluctance to formulate a philosophic theory of science may not be due merely to fear of doubt as to the validity of science, but rather to a habit of specialization, along with the recognition that so many of their conclusions are tentative and hypothetical, so that any attempt at this juncture to formulate

a set philosophy would be premature and unstable. And this may apply especially to those relativity and quantum theories which Dr. Eddington chiefly invokes, concerning which there is no clear definition yet agreed upon. Dr. Eddington would be content to ascertain the philosophy which, "whether true or not", he considers to be implicit in the outlook of modern physicists, but as the modern additions to physics appear not to have advanced beyond the stage of hypothesis, the study proposed by Dr. Eddington finds its place rather in a sub-section of the Theory of Knowledge, in that section namely wherein are analysed the status of mathematics, the data of hypotheses, and, in general, the nature of opinion.

In his own exposition (based on vision alone without reference to contact) Dr. Eddington constantly alternates between the objective and subjective points of view, without explaining their unity. The general assertion of subjectivity provides no complete theory of science, for the subject himself as an entity has not been explained in terms of that subjectivism, and Dr. Eddington's important chapter on the Concept of Existence contains no recognition of the existence of the qualitative nature of the human observer. Nerves and ideas would seem to be no less "existent" than the physical world which Kantism infers from them.

But Dr. Eddington has so far only adumbrated his theory of knowledge, and much importance will attach to its further development. There is already much in the present volume which shows that Nature, both objective and subjective, contains many qualities over and above the character of our theories about it. Yet maybe the true explanation of science has to be given, not by theoretical philosophers, but by practical technicians, who mediate between the theorist and the real world, and who would be certain to adopt a balanced view of the actual reality both of the scientist and of his tangible environment.

ARTHUR L. REYS.

*Spirit and Reality.* By Nicolas Berdyaev. (Bles : The Centenary Press. 8s. 6d. net.)

THE later works of Berdyaev are commonly classified—whether in admiration or in contempt or in sheer mystification—as "prophecy". The appellation is justified at least to the extent that it belongs to the prophet to assert and to proclaim, never to argue or to discuss. In *Spirit and Reality* there is no argument or discussion. With passionate conviction and manifest sincerity assertion is heaped on assertion, generalization on generalization, paradox on paradox.

One cannot review a prophet ; he must be taken or left. We can only demand his credentials for his claims to our reverential faith in his own vision, and at the same time claim the right to scrutinize the plausibility and coherence of its content. We may also inquire whether the theological and philosophical questions covered in *Spirit and Reality* are legitimately patient of this "prophetic" treatment.

Its basic message is that of a naïve dualism in which an esoteric manichaean gnosticism is restated in terms of a Kierkegaardian existentialism : a Kierkegaardian existentialism, be it noted, in which the dialectical "corrective" (to use Kierkegaard's own term) is presented as a dogma, and so reduced *ad absurdum*. The dualism is simple in the extreme. On the one hand are equated the Existential, the Real, the Subjective, the Good—Spirit and Freedom. On the other, the Non-existential, the Unreal, the Objective, the Rational and all its works—Non-being and Bondage.

Such dualism, expressed in varying terms, forms and myths, would seem to be a perennial obsession of the human mind, an obsession endowed with an immortality which renders it impervious to the criticism of generations of thinkers and even to the more radical and divine criticism which is the Incarnation. Berdyaev, at least, does not pause in his prophetic enthusiasm in order so much as to consider criticism. Nor does he stop to criticize. Incompatible beliefs are dismissed out of hand (where they are not, as are those of St. Thomas, positively misrepresented) as though their very incompatibility sufficed to condemn them.

Readers unable to stomach this initial dualism will find even less acceptable its subsequent resolution in the *Ungrund* of non-being—concerning which the Rev. W. G. Peck has said all that needs to be said in *Christendom*. They may be disinclined to read further in order to inspect the construction which, in his later chapters, Berdyaev builds on such dubious foundations. But Berdyaev has lost none of his keen insight in the interpretation of sublunary affairs, and there are many fine passages which, isolated from their general context, will be read with great profit. Even the much-criticized chapter on asceticism, for all its manifest faults as a general statement, affords some valuable correctives to common assumptions.

VICTOR WHITE, O.P.

*Doctrine and Action.* By Antonio de Oliveira Salazar. Translated by Robert Edgar Broughton. (Faber and Faber. 10s. 6d.net.)

THIS book is a collection of the more important addresses made by the head of the Portuguese state. Dr. Salazar is not afraid to



call himself a dictator, though he is at pains to point out the differences between his régime and the Fascism of Italy or the Nazism of Germany. There are other differences no less striking to the student of foreign affairs, but since they are in origin personal, we must not expect them to be stressed in this account. Nevertheless they stand out and, paradoxically perhaps, they have tended to obscure the importance of Dr. Salazar and his work from the anxiously watching eyes of the world. In competition with the cynical and sinister Stalin, the hysterical Hitler, and the thundering Mussolini, the quiet and confident tones of this university professor stand small chance of being heard in the present "Concert of Europe". Yet Portugal has been saved without noise and—what is more remarkable in view of the civil turmoil next door—without bloodshed. How has this miracle been brought to pass? This book does not completely answer the question; probably no single book could; but it does set the reader's mind free from the tyranny of certain racial prejudices and misconceptions that might easily prevent him from seeing that a momentous political experiment has been successfully carried out in this odd corner of the world. Dr. Salazar not only expounds his theories but describes in some detail the means he adopted to carry them to fruition; the book therefore amply justifies its double title.

The author makes it difficult for an Englishman to offer a reasoned critique of the book based on our own political experience, since he evades comparison by his contention that whereas parliamentarism may suit the English, the Portuguese are unfitted for it. Coming from Portugal's representative, one has to accept that judgement if one wishes to steer clear of the charge of trying to force an alien system on a reluctant people; but it does lessen the value of the book for us, and it does, to say the least, take the sting out of Dr. Salazar's challenging assertion: "We are anti-democratic." In what sense? Absolutely—or merely as a temporary expedient? If the latter, we must listen to Dr. Salazar with courtesy but with that same feeling of uneasiness with which we accept our Indian viceroy's reasons for putting off indefinitely the day of complete self-government. The reasoning may be just, but the truth is unpalatable.

But if Dr. Salazar would have us understand that in his opinion man is not only incapable here and now of governing himself, but can never hope to attain to sufficient political wisdom for self-government, then issue must be joined. Such a statement seems to us to quench ruthlessly the light that first shone from the stable at Bethlehem. Our divine Lord left a commission to His Church to teach all nations, and the order to

teach presupposes the free acceptance of doctrine and the power and the will to order one's life according to its precepts. Modern despotism seems to claim that politics can contract out of this gradual reformation of the human race, and that the teaching of the Church, and therefore the acceptance of that teaching, must be confined to individual conduct and must not stray into the realms of political theory and action. This surely is to disintegrate man's conscience and to set up two standards of morality, one for personal ethics and another for political systems.

But these are matters too wide and deep to explore in the course of a short review. We must confine ourselves to more lowly and homely criticisms. The late G. K. Chesterton once said that he thought that the most perfect form of government might be a benevolent despotism. But the question arises, who is to define benevolence, and the still more urgent question, how is its continuance to be ensured? In the absence of any election machinery it would seem that we have to fall back on the old historic truth that an autocrat has fortunately only one neck. The corporative state has indeed election machinery, and while we are told that the parliamentary elector may be cajoled, bribed, duped and brow-beaten, we are left to infer that the corporative elector is free of these dangers. It may be so, but we should like to see a little more proof of this desirable consummation.

These strictures will not detract from the value of the book as an authoritative description of the means taken to rescue Portugal from political and economic chaos. To what extent the book may be profitably used as a guide to the politicians and statesmen of other nations will depend on their attitude to its central theme.

S. J. G.

*National Socialism and the Roman Catholic Church.* By Nathaniel Micklem. (Oxford University Press. 8s. 6d. net.)

ACCORDING to national-socialist principles there should be no real dispute between the party and Christianity. The claim is put forward, with a considerable degree of sincerity, that politics are of this world and the exclusive concern of the party, while Christianity is concerned with the next life (*Jenseits*) only and the churches should be content with teaching men about Heaven. In practice, however, the nazis themselves are inconsistent and the Church will not even admit the principle. National-socialism requires of its supporters a "positive Christianity", that is, a Christianity which shows men how to serve the state and to accept its *Weltanschauung*, and Hitler sees in the two confessions "equally valuable supports . . . *gleich wertvolle Stützen*" for the national-socialist system. But no Christianity worthy of the name can

be content to act as a mere prop to the state, and the task of teaching men about Heaven implies instruction as to how to act in this world in order to attain eternal happiness. The clash with the totalitarian state is inevitable.

The reason why the struggle between the Catholic Church and the national-socialist state had to come are given in some detail in the first half of Dr. Micklem's book. Most important of all is the fact that national-socialism is not simply a political system but a religion, a religion, moreover, which claims exclusive authority and totalitarian power. Dr. Micklem's reminder in this connexion is valuable: "Only by a strong effort of the imagination can English-speaking peoples take National-socialism seriously as a religion. But we do these nazis wrong if we think they do not mean precisely what they say" (p. 144). In this claim rather than in its encouragement of neo-pagan rites lies the real menace of Nazi-ism and the reason for its attraction for the German mind.

In a series of carefully analytical chapters, Dr. Micklem shows how the conflict arose on account of the principles worked out in *Mein Kampf* and officially taught by Alfred Rosenberg, indicates the relations of the party to the state, examines the concepts of "positive Christianity" and of "political Catholicism" and explains the chief clauses of the German concordat with the Holy See. All that Nazi-ism practises is a logical consequence of Hitler's own teaching, there is no ground for hoping that all would be well in the Church or in any other problem if he were to get rid of the more extreme elements. "Those who suppose that if only Herr Hitler would drop overboard his unpopular colleagues, Herr Alfred Rosenberg and Dr. Josef Goebbels, 'all would be lovely in the garden', have not paid due attention to the fundamental principles of *Mein Kampf*" (p. 11). The party, thus pledged to a bitter conflict with the Church, has at its disposal all the institutions of a highly organized and powerful state. There are no longer the democratic rights and free press which made it so much easier for the Church to defend herself during the *Kulturkampf* of Bismarck. The meaning of "positive Christianity" and "political Catholicism" could scarcely be more succinctly and clearly explained than they are at the end of p. 52: "Any type of religion that is prepared to affirm without qualification the ideals and principles of National-socialism is positive; any aspects of it which are unrelated to the dominant concepts of Race, Blood, and Soil are negative, and if any of these negative aspects should lead to questioning of the nazi *Weltanschauung* in respect of idea or practice in the name of religion, that type of religion is *eo ipso* political and beyond the bounds of toleration."

The author views the concordat as something carried through in the first flush of the nazi success, as an agreement envisaging differences on the exclusively political plane which inevitably became a dead letter when the religious character of National-socialism was more clearly revealed.

After this very valuable analysis of the nature and the causes of the struggle, Dr. Micklem tells again in a historical survey of 150 pages the tragic story of the relations between the Catholic Church and the nazi state since 1933. The first limitations of the Catholic press, the gradually increasing pressure on parents to withdraw their children from the "confessional" schools, the currency trials and the immorality processes (both of which concentrated on presenting the Church in the worst possible light rather than on the investigation of the small degree of truth which gave them plausibility) are described in detail and with adequate documentation. The persecution was intensified until, in 1937, Pope Pius XI was moved to issue the first encyclical ever written in German, condemning National-socialism in the strongest terms. A year later came the occupation of Austria and, in spite of Cardinal Innitzer's conciliatory attitude, a more direct and obvious persecution of the Church in that country.

There has been no change for the better since then. Even the outbreak of war, which might have been expected to open a period of toleration in order to unite the nation, does not seem to have lessened persecution but rather the contrary, and the terrorism in conquered Poland takes the form of a violent attack on the Catholic life of the people there. We cannot, however, fail to agree with Dr. Micklem's conclusion, *Nubicula est; transibit*. And when the cloud has passed this admirably documented work will provide for future students a thoroughly reliable account of the sad history of these days.

EDWARD QUINN.

*Republic for a Day.* By Michael Winch. (Hale. 12s. 6d. net.)

IN the excitement following upon the Munich Agreement, happenings in the remote land of Carpatho-Ukraine or "Ruthenia" are well-nigh forgotten. Its formation of an autonomous province of the Czechoslovak state, which lasted five months, and the proclamation of an independent republic in March 1939 belong to past history, and in *Republic for a Day* Mr. Winch gives a vivid description of these months. He is an unbiassed observer and he relates in a picturesque way all he has witnessed, his record being particularly valuable in view of the violent controversies which rage around the primitive country of these Carpathian Ruthenians. He leaves no doubt as to the fact that the whole scheme of

a "Great Ukraine" was engineered by the German nazi party (not the Wilhelmstrasse, which advocated a more cautious policy) in order to break up Czechoslovakia, and incidentally stir up trouble in Poland. Mr. Winch's conversation in Prague with a German diplomat was significant, as was that which he had with the representative of the Chust government in Prague. When Mr. Winch referred to "Ruthenia", he was corrected by the German: "'Carpatho-Ukraine,' he said, adding that Father Volosin, the provincial prime minister, had been told to call it that by the German legation. Father Volosin, in fact, was at that time in closer contact with the German legation when in Prague than with his own central government, and the next day it was the Germans, not the Czechs, who told me that he was in town and suggested that I might like to see him. The representative of the Chust government said that the future of Carpatho-Ukraine was in Hitler's hands. I set out for Chust feeling that I should almost have had a German, not a Czechoslovak, visa."

The writer describes the dragooning of the peaceful and backward peasant country by the farcical *Sitch*, Ukrainian storm troopers almost entirely composed not of local men at all, but of fugitives from Poland and Rumania. As far as they were concerned the fate of the land was irrelevant, as shown by the words of one of the highest Ukrainian personalities: "The turn of events has naturally been a blow for us. But Carpatho-Ukraine in itself never meant anything to us. It was a means to an end. We were only interested in the Great Ukraine idea—and that still lives."

Mr. Winch was not favourably impressed by members of the *Sitch*, whom he describes as "real villains—poor, bedraggled, undergrown ruffians from the lowest grade of society", and whilst staying at the Hotel Koruna at Chust, which was at the same time headquarters of that organization, he was doubtful as to the stories he heard from them concerning their victimization by the Poles in Galicia, as "one of the officials in the propaganda section had served for a year in the Holy Cross prison in Poland, which is reserved for the worst criminals, for an offence to which he admitted, and the shaven heads of some of the porters suggested that they too had not come straight from home". The feelings of the local population towards these intruders were not easy to guess: the existence of a concentration camp at Rachov, not shown to foreign correspondents, did not encourage Ruthenians to indulge in too outspoken comments, yet the writer does record a few remarks: "I am a Ruthenian. . . . This Ukrainian idea is the artificial work of a few men. It is all a puffed-up affair. There will be a free Ukraine one day, and it will be a rich country . . . but it is a long way to Kiev, a very long way." Or another:

"I speak Russian, that is to say Little Russian, the language of our Ruthenia."

The writer makes no claims to scholarly research, he simply notes down what he heard from various factions; he was told there was a difference between "Russki" and "Ruski" (Ruthenian), though actually the name "Ruthenian" is nothing but a latinized version of "Russian", the inhabitants of the Carpathians being nearer the Great Russians than are the Galicians in their language and way of life. Another error concerns the Ukrainian "national colours"—sky-blue and yellow—the same as Sweden's, which caused some speculations as to the possible Scandinavian origin of the Ruthenians! But as a matter of fact these colours were awarded by Austria to the Galician regiments in 1848 for their loyalty to the Habsburgs.

There are many amusing pictures of the people and their life, the large peasant families where the value of a child is far beneath that of a cow, for, as a peasant explained with disarming candour, "If I want a child I can make it myself without any effort, but if I want a cow I have to buy it." This book, both enlightening and entertaining, is well worth reading by those interested in eastern Europe and her problems.

G. BENNIGSEN.

*Civilization in East and West.* By H. N. Spalding. (Oxford University Press; Milford. 15s. net.)

To survey the East and the West, to map the past and plot the future, needs a person of considerable attainments. Mr. Spalding thus describes the kind of man who would be ideally fitted for the task: "He should be poet and lawyer and man of science in one: able to creep into the skin of each society and reveal the secrets of its desires, to define with nice precision, to marshal evidence and reason from it. He should have the foresight of the statesman, the insight of the philosopher, the soul-sight of the saint."

That is a formidable list of virtues and graces, but no man will say that any one can be safely omitted if the work is to be of value. And if the author must be so versatile and so panoplied, how shall the reviewer be adequately equipped for his task? In point of fact honesty no less than modesty bids me confess that I am temperamentally unfitted to be a critic of these large-scale operations, for they seem to me to demand a degree of detachment and Olympian aloofness from the errors, the foibles and the prejudices of our common humanity that I find it difficult to credit in a fellow member of the universe. Either the task is too great, or



it is too simple. The man who shall take, in the palm of his hand so to speak, the great leaders—Confucius, Isaias, Christ, Plato and Paul, weigh them one against another, sift the wheat from the chaff in their teachings, such a man must be of stature gigantic, mental and moral, or else his judgements will make pigmies of his subjects. It is all done, I know, with proper expressions of modesty and diffidence, and with the best intentions in the world, but (for me at least) it lacks reverence and is instinct with the modern and false assumption that the present stands possessed in its own right of all the garnered wisdom of the past. So an executor parcels out in lots the accumulated riches of the testator to the legatees, never considering that neither he nor they have the intelligence or the industry to amass this wealth now so easily divided and dissipated.

And yet, it may be argued, someone must make an inventory; the riches are there and they must be counted and valued before we proceed to probate. But again we need to be reminded that if they are to be preserved and increased and not just spent, we require to know something of the way in which they were accumulated, the experience, the judgements, the anxieties, that went to their making, the toil and labour and self-sacrifice that built them up. If we have no conception of these activities and no intention of emulating them we may indeed inherit our fortune but we shall do nothing with it except dissipate it; we shall, as they say, live on our capital.

These are some of the thoughts that come to the common man as he surveys the wealth of quotation, the fruit of vast reading and erudition, brought together in this book. It is all ticketed, compared and analysed, and it will no doubt come to be recognized by the student as a very valuable collection; in that sense the book justifies its secondary title as an introduction to the study of human progress, and the author may well be satisfied with the result of his labours. But the common man—and more especially in these days—looks beyond these academic studies and demands some assurance that study will result in action. To that end he knows that synthesis is more important than analysis and the first requisite for an effective synthesis is a correct standard of evaluation of the component parts. Here is the crux of the matter, for the orthodox Christian holds that the Christian revelation, precisely because it is a revelation, cannot be lumped together with the philosophizings of Chinese, Islamic and Grecian sages, be they never so wise. It is of the essence of Christian teaching that it is distinguished from the fumbling approach to truth made by man's unaided reason, and it must be given its rightful place as a divine revelation. This view must be accepted

or rejected ; it cannot be ignored, for that would be to destroy the Christian dynamic which is the one hope of the world.

S. J. G.

*A History of Poland.* By George Slocombe. (Nelson. 10s. 6d. net.)

FROM the misty legends of Slav antiquity, in the country watered by the Vistula and its tributaries, the nucleus of Poland emerges into history under some form of organized kingly authority about the middle of the tenth century. Mieszko I was her first Christian prince, and under him Christianity advanced into Poland from both east and west. The Greco-Slav rite spread from Moravia where it had been introduced by the Bulgarian missionaries sent by Ignatius, the patriarch of Constantinople ; while the Latin form of Catholicism found its way to the heart of the kingdom with the Czech princess Dombrowska, who became the wife of Mieszko I in 966. It was Mieszko's acceptance of Catholicism in its Latin form which had such vast consequences for the future of Poland, for, as Mr. Slocombe puts it, "while the Russians were entertaining, as it were, and becoming overwhelmed by the vanguards of Orientalism, the Poles had voluntarily and quite literally become crusaders in a special sense ; outposts of Christian culture, of the civilization of Rome and the Latin spirit. And this heavy charge, then and during the succeeding brilliant centuries of her history, Poland faithfully fulfilled, against the influence of Byzantium and the bodily menace of the Mongol and the Turk."

Mieszko's son, Boleslaw I—Boleslas the Brave, the Polish Charlemagne, as he is called—who reigned from 992 to 1025, achieved the conversion of the country, and has rightly been styled the founder of Poland and its greatness, based on Catholicism. He conquered Pomerania, and urged on the conversion of the pagan Prussians, one of his great missionaries, St. Adalbert of Prague, being martyred by them in 997, and later receiving the title of patron saint of Poland. It was one of Boleslaw's sisters who married King Swegn of Denmark, and became the mother of our King Canute. As with the western Charlemagne, there followed after Boleslaw's death a period of disruption till Casimir the Restorer (1034-1058) succeeded to the crown. He carried on by peaceful means the unification which his grandfather had begun by force of arms. It was under his son and successor, Boleslaw the Bold, that the martyrdom of St. Stanislas occurred, in circumstances not unlike those which attended the assassination of our St. Thomas Becket, an echo across Europe of the far-reach-

ing problem of Investitures. Boleslaw was excommunicated by Pope Gregory VII, and died in exile. It was a third Boleslaw, the Wry-Mouthed (1102-1138), who restored some semblance of unity, and with Danish help won for Poland her most cherished possession, an outlet on the Baltic, the preservation of which was the touchstone of the policy of all her greatest kings. The Polish hold on the mouth of the Vistula was to become the crux of a problem which eight centuries of history have not yet solved.

With the death of Boleslaw III the kingdom was divided into five principalities, with resulting dissension and weakness, and the loss of Pomerania, soon to become the cradle of the German menace to Poland. It was an ill-starred decision on the part of one of the princes, Conrad of Mazovia, to call in the Teutonic Knights to help in the work of converting the pagan Prussians on the northern borders. The knights began a process of extermination in Prussia, rooting out the inhabitants or driving them into exile. They then settled down in the ravaged lands, not only as land-owners, in imitation of other missionary orders, but claiming all the powers of lordship and suzerainty. For a time the Poles overcame the knights and succeeded in securing stable access to the Baltic; but the problem of Eastern Prussia was to persist, and with it the German stranglehold on the great artery of Poland's economic life.

With the coronation of Ladislas the Short (Wladilaw Lokietek), at Cracow in 1319, a single kingship was restored. It was his son, Casimir the Great (1333-1370), who by peaceful and diplomatic means built up the Polish empire which was to be one of the glories of the later middle ages. The union with Lithuania, and the establishment of Greater Poland under the Jagiellon kings, consolidated a stronghold of western culture, and at the same time a centre of Slav independence against Germany.

The Reformation in Poland found strongest support among the aristocracy, jealous of the Church's wealth and exemption from taxation; but the reforming movement made little headway in face of the strong faith of the peasants and the decision of Sigismund II to adhere to the papacy, despite a divorce case somewhat similar to that of our own Henry VIII. The reformers had no real leaders, though John Laski, better known over here as John a Lasco, achieved some notoriety in this country under Edward VI. There was in Poland no persecution of the new movement, "I am not king of your consciences" being the attitude of both Sigismund I and Sigismund II. With the death of the latter in 1572 the great Jagiellon line came to an end, and after the short military glory of Stephen Batori, the conqueror of

Danzig and the great enemy of Moscow, the Swedish line of the Vasas came to govern Poland, and to accentuate that great evil of Polish national life, the deep chasm between the peasant serfs and the aristocratic landowners, with the fatal absence of a strong middle class and a self-supporting yeomanry. Sobieski's spectacular relief of Vienna in 1683 was a brilliant interlude, but the eighteenth century was a long sad story of decay, culminating in the tragedy of partition, one of the great crimes of European history, under the evil genius of Catherine the Great. Various reasons have been given to account for the collapse of the Polish state. Mr. Slocombe enumerates most of them: the elective character of the monarchy; the absurdity of the *liberum veto* in the Diet, by which a single dissentient voice could prove a permanent bar to legislation; the lack of a strong middle class; the growing pressure of Russia and Prussia; but he does not give due weight to the strong Russian hatred of the thing which had been the making of Poland, her Catholicism.

After the brief Napoleonic duchy of Warsaw, the Congress of Vienna ingenuously hoped that the Poles would find peace in the "Congress Kingdom" with a Czar of Russia on the throne. The kingdom had some small chance of survival under Alexander I, to whom Mr. Slocombe is more than generous, but when Nicholas I revived the policy of persecution, revolt was inevitable. The risings of 1830 and 1863 were a national resistance to the policy of russification. With the repression of the latter, the rise of industry and the development of business, a new, more practical spirit began to animate the Poles, and during the century prosperity increased. The war of 1914-1918 saw many tragic divisions, but with the armistice the opportunity for restoration dawned—an opportunity full of promise, but fraught with difficulties. These were all either already overcome, or on the way to solution, not without incidental mistakes, when the German destroyer marched again and once more Poland was obliterated from the map of Europe.

Mr. Slocombe's substantial book is a revision, only partially carried through, of a survey of Polish history first published in 1916. It is broad and popular rather than deep and academic, the work of a competent journalist rather than a learned scholar. The bibliography is an odd assortment of publications of widely varying dates and values. There are a number of inaccuracies and misprints, almost all on matters of detail, but the book as a whole should provide what many people have been looking for in English—a reasonably just impression of the general pattern of Polish history.

A. B.

*Mrs. Fitzherbert.* By Shane Leslie. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 15s. net.)

"TIME is the great destroyer of evidence, but he is also the great protector of titles," said Plunket. "He comes with a scythe in one hand to mow down the muniments of our possession, while he holds an hour-glass in the other from which he incessantly metes out the portions of duration that are to render the muniments no longer necessary." This charming analogy with which the Irish lawyer-politician once relieved the arid wastes of legal argument may well serve as an introduction to this review. In the case of Mrs. Fitzherbert, Time the Destroyer had a great deal of help. As Mr. Leslie says, "after all the precautions taken to destroy letters and abscond papers, it is almost a miracle for any biography to be possible. Research for material leads the gleaner from bonfire to bonfire. At times it has seemed useless to proceed."

But Mr. Leslie did proceed. Time, the Protector of Titles, found an ally. It is an enthralling story in itself, this battle between the Destroyer and the Vindicator. At the head of the Destroyer's agents we find the grim figure of the Iron Duke, burning Mrs. Fitzherbert's papers solemnly in her presence, resolved to sink her records and her reputation without leaving a trace. He respected Mrs. Fitzherbert immensely, but he owed the state his duty . . . the burning went on endlessly. The Vindicator found his allies in her Catholic relatives, who were determined to set forth the facts and what documents remained, making plain to the world the virtues and the integrity of Mrs. Fitzherbert.

Lord Holland's *Memoirs*, which appeared in 1854, had the effect of raising anew the question of Mrs. Fitzherbert's marriage and of leading the Hon. Charles Langdale to write the *Memoirs of Mrs. Fitzherbert* (1856). This work is very rare, since the edition was limited to 500 copies and it was not reprinted. In 1905 another champion entered the field—W. H. Wilkins. When all the difficulties which beset him are considered, he did a very fine piece of work in his *Mrs. Fitzherbert and George IV* (2 Vols.), and the best tribute to Mr. Leslie, as I think he would himself agree, is to say that his book supersedes Wilkins's as a final, definitive work. Many private papers concerning Mrs. Fitzherbert's life with the prince have been preserved among the family archives of Mr. Leslie, who is a descendant of Minnie Seymour, her adopted daughter. These and the archives of other notable families (the Portarlingtons, the Seymours, etc.) have been examined. His Majesty the King has followed the good precedent of Edward VII

(who allowed Wilkins to examine the papers which Mrs. Fitzherbert had placed in Coutts's Bank in 1833) and permitted the author to draw upon hitherto withheld and unpublished material in the Windsor archives.

On one important point I think Wilkins is more satisfactory than the later writer—that is in his detailed considerations of the canonical and legal aspects of the royal marriage (see particularly Wilkins, chapter vii, "The Validity of the Marriage"). The marriage took place between George Augustus Frederick, Prince of Wales, and Maria Fitzherbert, widow, on the 15 December, 1785. It was illegal, but valid in Catholic canon law and according to the authorized doctrines of the Church of England. Wilkins quotes fully on the matter from an article which appeared in *THE DUBLIN REVIEW* for October 1854, and to ensure complete accuracy he submitted this article to Father Gavin, S.J., whose opinions are given in the subjoined footnotes. The Prince and Mrs. Fitzherbert were married before the Rev. Robert Burt, Protestant vicar of Twickenham. According to the decrees of the Council of Trent a marriage to be lawful and valid must take place before a priest; but these decrees had not been promulgated in England, and so the marriage was valid in Catholic eyes, the presence of a priest not being necessary according to pre-Tridentine canon law.

When the Royal Marriage Act of 1772 was passed "for the better regulating the future marriages of the Royal Family", Convocation was not consulted for the simple reason that it did not exist. This curious piece of legislation was introduced after the King's brothers, Gloucester and Cumberland, had been clandestinely married to English subjects. Certain Anglican canonists argued that the act was a breach of the Reformation settlement in Church and State, an unwarrantable intrusion of the temporal power into the sphere of the spiritual. Parliament had powers to pass what laws it pleased, but none whatever to force them upon the Church of England. Thus we had here a conflict between civil and canon law which may be compared with the well-known controversy today about the "remarriage" of divorced persons: no Anglican clergyman can be forced to marry them, for the canon law of the Church forbids such marriages, treating them as invalid. Yet they are perfectly legal.

In spite of the dazzle of quotation marks and source indications which there necessarily must be in a work of this description, the reader is not disappointed when he looks for the epigrams and the verbal fireworks which Mr. Leslie's name leads him to expect. Here are two examples. Queen Caroline's determination to share the honours of her husband's coronation: "After six years of



shabby and disreputable touring on the continent, she prepared to descend upon her spouse. Her position was something betwixt Catharine of Aragon and a Tichborne claimant, combining the status of one with the vulgarity of the other." Lady Conyngham's relations with George IV: "Their cooings were profound but elderly. . . . In the world of court and diplomacy she was regarded as his mistress. The boredom and emoluments of that position were hers, but no one would seriously suppose there could be any romance or passion between the portly friends."

Mr. Leslie continues to play the advocate for George IV (see his biography of George IV in the "Curiosities of Politics" series, 1926). I cannot travel the whole road with him here. The Victorians abhorred his morals and were indifferent to his standards of taste: they therefore inferred that he had no brains or capabilities. Mr. Leslie proves that he had abilities, and knowing that our artistic standards are somewhat higher than the Victorians', he makes the best of George IV's patronage of Lawrence and Canova. But as far as personal character goes George IV was a cad, and nowhere is this more evident than in his treatment of Mrs. Fitzherbert. There is a pettiness and a feline quality about many of his acts and sayings which make it impossible for posterity to adopt him as a hero. True his love letters are impressive, but rather too impressive, and remind us of the saying that men who can write good love letters make shocking husbands: George IV was the world's worst. Mr. Leslie is, however, scrupulously fair in his presentation, and I could continue my case against George IV by using the materials which Mr. Leslie himself provides—always a good test. There are no Stracheyan tricks here. As Mr. Leslie himself says, "modern biography tends to brilliant selection and unfair suggestion". He avoids the tantalizing snares of this school and sticks to the good old-fashioned style, even giving us quotations at the head of his chapters in the manner of a Scott novel. The illustrations and the whole production of the book is excellent. We eagerly await the second volume, the letters.

ROBERT AUBREY NOAKES.

*Eusebius Matthopoulos: Founder of "Zoe".* By Archimandrite Seraphim Papakosta. Translated by A. Massauti. (2s. 6d. net.)

*Holy Moscow.* By Nicholas Arseniev. (S.P.C.K. Paper, 2s. 6d.; cloth, 4s. 6d. net.)

"Zoe", one of the most important phenomena in the Eastern Orthodox Church today, is an active cenobitical brotherhood in

Greece, having about eighty members and helpers, a dozen of whom are clerics. Its primary work is preaching, in which all the members, clerical or lay, engage; after that there is the hearing of confessions by the priests (it is "Zoe's" experience that "it is much more difficult to develop confessors than to train preachers"), writing and publishing, and religious instruction in Sunday-schools. Its weekly, also called *Zoe*, has a circulation of over 75,000. The members are not bound by vows, they have no written rule, they do not accept donations, and the only property they are bound to put into the common stock is their income from preaching and writing.

Of late years the influence of "Zoe" has penetrated to every corner of Greece, and it is a brief biography of the principal founder of this remarkable institution that Archimandrite Seraphim puts before us. Father Eusebius Matthopoulos, who died in 1929 at the age of eighty-one, was a monk of the monastery of Megaspylaen, under the well-known Hieromonk Ignatius Lampropoulos, on whose death he went to Athens and came under the sway of the influential preacher, Apostolos Makrakes. This was the beginning of the troubled and fine career, leading to the public appearance of "Zoe" in 1911, which Archimandrite Seraphim has sketched. It is a story of very great interest, from which Father Eusebius emerges, in the words of the late Archbishop Chrysostom of Athens, as "the embodiment of goodness, of self-abnegation, of love and of humility".

Archimandrite Seraphim writes of a life which still goes on in its work; Professor Arseniev is concerned with what has gone for ever—the religious and spiritual life of Moscow in the nineteenth century. His picture of a part of that life and of Orthodox Russian society is likely to be an eye-opener for many Catholics. Many remarkable personalities are referred to, many (to us) curious trends, and Mr. Arseniev speaks his mind for or against them forcibly and picturesquely, if at times a whit vaguely, as in his critical but appreciative account of Vladimir Solovyev, parts of which even Orthodox might challenge; it is notable in this connexion that Mr. Arseniev associates the name of Möhler with that of Khomyakov in contrast with Solovyev.

It is interesting and pleasing to find in this world, whose religious life was so bound up with the Eastern Church, the prominent figure of a Western Catholic: almost the last ten pages of the book are devoted to a German physician, F. P. Haas, whose passion to ameliorate the lot of convicts gives him a high place among Mr. Arseniev's "types of righteousness". "Haas," he says, "did not help because it was good and moral to do so; his life and all his being consisted simply in serving and helping his

neighbour. More and more did he grow in love." Altogether a useful, if rather flowery, little book.

Both these books would have been improved by a little judicious editing: foreign names are not transliterated consistently, and such words as "hieromonachos" need to be translated.

T. O. P.

*St. Vincent Ferrer.* By Henri Ghéon. Translated by F. J. Sheed (Sheed & Ward. 6s. net.)

"To say that Henri Ghéon is the master-hagiographer would be cliché," says the publishers' blurb. Whether cliché or not, it would be very gross exaggeration. Mr. Ghéon is certainly an accomplished and sometimes penetrating writer, and his hagiographies are very popular in French and English; but are they at bottom very much more than the ordinary, rather uncritical, "saint's life", adorned with literary airs and graces and a halo of romanticism?

Knowledge of St. Vincent Ferrer is generally confined to his adherence to the cause of "Benedict XIII", called pope in his own obedience, during the "Great Schism", and to the miracle of the workman who fell off a building; and it is therefore good that Ghéon should turn his talents to making this great Dominican better known, a "politician, ecstatic, great penitent, theologian, healer, preacher and miracle-worker". "In two words, man and angel," Ghéon goes on—and in those two words indicates a weakness of his own hagiological writing, and of all like it. Every saint is a human being, a human being of heroically good quality, and to drag in angels is to deform the saint—and to discourage us others. Provoking, too, are the traces, as in Ghéon's other books, of what seems almost an invertedly snobbish "childlike acceptance": it is true that we are to "become as little children", but St. Paul spoke of "putting away childish things"—the "little way" of St. Teresa of Lisieux is not for everybody. This book is not for everybody, but it will be much read and, on the whole, deservedly and profitably read.

Mr. Ghéon begins his introduction by saying that the world seems "to get the Ferrers it deserves", citing St. Vincent for the fourteenth century and Nicholas Ferrer for the nineteenth; it would have been a graceful touch had he added another Nicholas, Ferrar though he was, for seventeenth-century England.

F. W.

*The Baiga.* By Verrier Elwin. (Murray. 30s. net.)

THE Baiga are a small aboriginal tribe living remotely in central India, one of the most primitive people in the world, and as a

result of his six years' sojourn among them, Mr. Elwin has produced what Professor J. H. Hutton, of Cambridge, regards as "perhaps the greatest thing of its kind that has yet been done". Mr. Elwin has not only that pertinent knowledge which is a necessary condition precedent to a work of this kind, he has what is more important—human sympathy with the subjects of his study, an objective temper of mind, patience, an unwearying eye and ear, and also the ability to write down his observations and conclusions in an acceptable way.

This volume is exhaustive—over 500 pages of it, and many illustrations—but never exhausting, even for the general reader. It covers intimately and with understanding every aspect of life of a people in a "primitive" stage of culture and civilization, illustrated by actual life-histories of individuals and verbatim quotations.

With so many examples before us, from Malinovsky to Ernest Crawley, it was to be expected that Mr. Elwin would give due attention to the various aspects of sexuality among the Baiga, and he treats it in detail, though at no greater length than the subject requires. One is impressed (not for the first time) by how far, on the "natural plane", sexuality among Christians is at its best an improvement on that of "untutored primitives"—and how far at its worst it falls below theirs. The great problem for the Baiga in recent times has been the attempt to wean them from their traditional *bewar*, "shifting cultivation", to plow cultivation. Mr. Elwin examines the matter dispassionately; he concludes that advantage is not all on the side of the plow, especially as "the contrast between a bewar-cutting village and a 'civilized' village is astonishing; the social and religious life of the latter is emasculated, void of reality and vigour". It is not surprising to find that Mr. Elwin asks for the establishment of forest areas reserved for Baiga, that they be protected more adequately from the rapacity of minor officials, and that a more suitable code of law be provided for them: the very things which Mr. Alain Gerbault pleads for on the other side of the world, for the indigenous people of French Polynesia.

One of the things in which the Christian missionary today is better off than his predecessor is the number of reliable books at his disposal on the anthropology and ethnology of remote peoples. It is whispered that all missionaries do not profit by them as much as they might. If all whom it may concern do not find this book of great practical value it will not be Mr. Elwin's fault.

F. W.

*The Irish Dramatic Movement.* By Una Ellis-Fermor, M.A., B.Litt. (Methuen. 10s. 6d. net.)

*The Irish Theatre.* Edited by Lennox Robinson. (Macmillan. 7s. 6d. net.)

MISS ELLIS-FERMOR is already known for her books on Marlowe and on the Jacobean drama, and she now gives us a timely and useful estimate (up to 1912) of the Irish contribution to dramatic literature seen in its world setting. It is well that this should be done by somebody who is not Irish, for it takes from her claims for it any suspicion of partiality, and Miss Ellis-Fermor carries on her discussion with much competence and very thoroughly. She has a knack of making arresting and persuasive observations without any suggestion of mere "epigramatism", and her estimates of the work of the great, and lesser, figures from Yeats onwards are sound, balanced and well-informed. The promised second volume, bringing the subject down to date, will complete a very excellent work.

The book edited by Mr. Lennox Robinson consists of the lectures given during the Abbey Theatre Festival at Dublin in 1938, and is naturally considerably more "domestic" than Miss Ellis-Fermor's. In their history the contributors are talking of what they know at first hand and their criticism is enlivened by personal dealings with the dramatists concerned over a number of years. Their scope is the early history of the Abbey Theatre, the rise of the "realistic movement", and the work of those who from nothing at all made the Irish dramatic movement what it is—Synge, Lady Gregory, Yeats and the rest—together with papers on Gaelic drama (Ernest Blythe) and problem plays, so-called (Michael MacLiammoir). The whole book is most readable and enlightening; for the present reviewer the outstanding contributions are Mr. Walter Starkie's lively handling of Sean O'Casey and Mr. Frank O'Connor's paper about Synge, with its animadversions on Professor Corkery.

L. E.

*A Dictionary of the Popes.* Compiled by Donald Attwater. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 10s. 6d. net.)

THIS is a very useful compendium, containing much valuable information not usually within reach of those who do not live near a well-equipped library. The author has drawn upon the ordinary sources—in particular the work of Mgr. Mann and Ludwig von Pastor—and lays stress on the religious and ecclesiastical rather than on the purely political activities of the popes. He in no way glosses over what is unworthy, discreditable or

mistaken in these lives, and the legendary and "edifying" element finds no place in them. The life of the first pope, St. Peter, deserves a special word of commendation for its vivid conciseness.

In assessing the value of a work of this kind one naturally turns to the accounts of those popes who ruled the Church during periods of crisis in its history—the schism between East and West; the "Great Schism of the West"; the Reformation; and the period through which we are now passing. A judicial and balanced account is given of the lives and actions of the popes during these periods, and, while no attempt is made to turn biography into history by a complete elucidation of cause and effect, the facts are presented in such a way as to give a clear idea of the part played by individual popes in the history of their times.

The life of Pius XI is particularly full and informative, especially in regard to the new political situations and his attitude towards them, and to his work for the reunion of the dissident East, and for the missions. There is a short and up-to-date notice of our present pontiff, who is indexed as the 257th successor of St. Peter.

H. Sr. J.

*The Catholic Directory*, 1940. (4s. net.)

*The Catholic Who's Who*, 1940. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 6s. net.)

It is good to find these two hardy annuals appearing as usual, the only difference, due to present conditions, being a slight increase in price of the Directory. For this Directory there can be, as usual, nothing but praise; it would seem, however, desirable that the list of dioceses, etc. throughout the world should be checked over with the same publishers' *Orbis Catholicus*: some of those listed in the Directory have disappeared for practical purposes long ago, and the terminology used for the Eastern-rite eparchies is confusing. The account of the functions of the Roman Congregations needs bringing up to date where at least one of them is concerned.

For the Who's Who (wittily introduced this year by that accomplished writer, Father Philip Hughes), more reserve is required. As it stands it is a godsend to the "chariteer"—Mr. Shane Leslie must be thanked for that splendid word—and to the snob. But I venture to think that for everybody else it would be twice as useful were it half the size and half the price: the remarks of Jotter in the *Catholic Herald* seem only too well justified, as some reviewers have been pointing out for a good many years.

L. E.



